

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. III.

No. 10.

---

## I.—THE NEW REVISION OF KING JAMES' REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

### II.

#### AN EXAMINATION OF THE REVISION OF S. MATTHEW.

In this and the following papers it is intended to give an account of the changes in the Greek text and in the translation. To the changes in the text will be added the editorial or the MS. authority or both; and to the changes adopted in the translation will be appended the authority of the earlier version or versions, whether public or private, and whenever the changes of the Revisers are original, this will be indicated by the phrase *by a new rendering*. Wycliffe, Tyndale, Cranmer, the Genevan, the Rheims, and the Authorized Version will be referred to together, and in this order, and the phrase *the rest* will designate all of these versions that follow the one mentioned or all beside those mentioned. In some instances a word or phrase will be discussed which the Revisers adopted from the Authorized Version; and wherever a word or phrase, quoted or discussed, was first introduced by the Authorized Version, this also will be indicated by the phrase *by a new rendering*. Where a rendering had appeared in any previous version, such rendering for convenience will be said to be *after* such version, whether actually derived from it or not.

Wycliffe translated from the Latin Vulgate and of course had no definite article before him, but he will be said to retain or omit this article just as the other versions are said to do.

The use of the italics in King James' Revision or in the New Revision or in both will be regularly noticed in the first five chapters, but afterward only special cases will be noticed.

The following works are referred to in the course of this examination and the abbreviated forms of citation are appended in parentheses.

I. GREEK TESTAMENTS, described in the introduction (*Lachmann*) (*Tischendorf*) (*Tregelles*).

## II. CELEBRATED AND PUBLIC VERSIONS OR REVISIONS.

Vulgata Editio Clementis VIII auctoritate edita. 8°. Parisiis, 1855. (*Vulg.*)  
 —New Testament. According to the Version by John Wycliffe and Revised by John Purvey. Ed. by Forshall and Madden in 4° and reprinted in 12°. Oxford, 1879. (*Wycl.*)—New Testament translated by Tyndale, by Cranmer, the Geneva of 1557, and the Rheims, in Bagster's Hexapla. 4°. London, 1841. (*Tynd.*) (*Cran.*) (*1st Gen.*) (*Rh.*)—The New Testament, etc. 4°. London, 1588. (*Gen.* or *2d Gen.*), which gives the improved readings of the edition of 1560.—New Testament. Translated out of the Original Greek, etc. fol. London, 1611. (*Ed.* 1611; the Preface to this ed. being quoted by the pages of Dr. Scrivener's 4° ed.)—Das Neue Testament nach der deutschen Uebersetzung Dr. Martin Luthers. Revidierte Ausg. 12°. Halle, 1867. (German Revision, *Germ. Rev.*)—Het Nieuwe Testament op Nieuw Uit den Grondtekst overgezet. 8° maj. Amsterdam, 1868. (Holland Revision, *Holl. Rev.*)

## III. PRIVATE VERSIONS OR REVISIONS.

The Gospel according to Saint Matthew. Translated from the Greek by Sir John Cheke, the First Regius Prof. of Greek under Henry VIII. 8°. Lond. 1843. (*Sir John Cheke.*)—The Four Gospels. Translated from the Greek with Preliminary Dissertations, etc. By George Campbell, D. D., Principal of Marischal College, Aberdeen. 2 vols. 4°. Lond. 1790. (*Dr. Campbell.*)—Die Heilige Schrift. Uebersetzt von Dr. de Wette. 8° maj. Heidelberg, 1839. (*de Wette.*)—Le Nouveau Testament selon la Vulgate. Par L'Abbé J. B. Glaire. 16°. Paris, 1861. (*the Abbé Glaire.*)—The New Testament. A new Translation from a Revised Text of the Original. [By John Nelson Darby, Founder of the Sect of the Plymouth Brethren.] 2d ed. revised. 16°. London, 1872. (*Mr. Darby.*)—The New Testament. Translated from the Greek Text of Tischendorf. By George R. Noyes, D. D. [Prof. in the Divinity School of Harvard College]. 12°. Boston, 1868. (*Dr. Noyes.*)—The New Testament, etc. By Henry Alford, D. D. 16°. London, 1869. (*Dean Alford.*)—The New Testament. Translated from the critical Text of von Tischendorf. By Samuel Davidson, D. D. 12°. Lond. 1875. (*Dr. Davidson.*)—Das Neue Testament. Uebersetzt von Carl Weissäcker, D. Th. 12°. Tübingen, 1875. (*Weissäcker.*)—Le Nouveau Testament d'après le Texte Grec par Louis Segond, D. en Th. à Genève. 12°. Oxford, 1880. (*Dr. Segond.*)

## IV. WORKS IN ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Addison: The Spectator. 12°. Tonson, Lond. 1749. (*Addison, Spect.*)—Beckington: Journal by One of the Suite of Thomas Beckington a. 1442. 8°. London, 1828. (*Journal of Beckington.*)—Bentley: Eight Sermons preached at the Boyle Lecture, 1692. 8°. Oxford, 1809. (*Bentley's Sermons.*)—Burke: Thoughts on the Present Discontents. 12°. Oxford, 1874. (*Burke's Thoughts, etc.*)—Davison: Life of William Davison, Secretary of State, etc. to Queen Elizabeth. By Sir Harris Nicolas. 8°. Lond. 1823. (*Life of Davison.*)—Dryden: The Prose Works of John Dryden. Ed. by Malone. 4 vols. 8°. Lond. 1800. (*Dryden.*)—Ellis: Original Letters Illustrative of English History. By Sir Henry Ellis. Third Series. 4 vols. 8°. Lond. 1846. (*Ellis, Original Letters.*)—Felltham: Resolves Divine, etc. By Owen Felltham. 12°. Lond. 1840. (*Felltham.*)—Fox: History of Reign of James II. By Charles James Fox. 12°. Lond. 1857. (*Fox's History.*)—Liddon: Sermons preached before the Univ. of Oxford

By H. P. Liddon, D. D. Second Series. 12°. Oxford, 1879. (*Liddon's Univ. Sermons*.)—Maundrell: A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, A. D. 1697. By Henry Maundrell, Fell. of Ex. College. 12°. Oxford, 1703. (*Maundrell's Journey*.)—Morley: Edmund Burke: A Historical Study by John Morley. 8°. Lond. 1867. (*Morley's Burke, Hist. Study*.)—Selden: Table Talk, etc. of John Selden. 8°. Lond. 1696. (*Selden, T. T.*)—Sidney: The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia, by Sir Philip Sidney. fol. Lond. 1655. (*Sidney's Arcadia*.)—Spedding: Reviews and Discussions, by James Spedding. 8°. Lond. 1879. (*Spedding's Reviews, etc.*) Temple: The Works of Sir William Temple. 4 vols. 8°. Lond. 1770. (*Temple*.)—Walton: The Complete Angler. By Izaak Walton. 12°. Lond. 1876. Facsimile reprint of First Ed. 1653. (*Walton's Angler*.)

CH. I. V. I. *The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham*: so A. V. after Wycliffe, but in the Greek there is no article, as if this were the heading of this Gospel or of the genealogy; and so it may be rendered more closely: Book of the generation of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham; and so Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson.—v. 2, etc. *Judah-Perez*, etc., being conformed by the rule of the Revisers to the usage of the A. V. in the Old Testament, which gave the names directly from the Hebrew instead of adopting the forms of the Greek in the LXX.—v. 6. *And David*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; And David the king, A. V.—v. 11. *at the time of the carrying away to Babylon*, after Mr. Darby nearly; about the time they were carried away to Babylon, A. V. after Tyndale: the marginal of the Rev. is better, the removal to Babylon, as this expresses the euphemism of the Greek (ἡ μετακείσια = change of abode) for exile in the Hebrew (cf. LXX. 4-K. 24, 16 ἡ μετακείσια for גִּזְלוֹ, and 1 Chron. 5, 6 μετακίξω for גִּזְלוֹ). So Cicero would never consent to denote his exile as such, but by the terms *discessus* and *absum*; as de Leg. 2, 17; pro Sest. 34.—v. 17. *are*, supplied, but not italicized; *are*, A. V. It was the general intention of A. V. to distinguish (that is, in their own ed. of 1611, to put into small Roman letters) all the words they supplied as wanting in the Greek. This they did not carry out fully and consistently, though it is in general a valuable and important feature of their work. The Greek under certain circumstances omits the object of a verb as easily as its subject, but A. V. italicized the former when they supplied it, but not the latter; it easily omits the copula *is* and *are*, and this they regularly italicized; they often supplied the definite article without italicizing it. They sometimes used italics under a misapprehension, as in 10, 17; and sometimes omitted them even when the insertion was important, as in 2, 12, 22. The Revisers

use italics sparingly. When the object of a verb has once been expressed and then omitted, they repeat it by a pronoun, as *him, her, it, them*, etc., without italics. They do not italicize the forms of the copula *is* and *are*, but do italicize other forms of it, as *shall be*, 10, 36. They supply the definite article without italics. When a word is regularly employed absolutely in Greek, they supply the complement sometimes in italics, as 1, 6; 10, 2, 3; S. Mark 16, 1; and sometimes in Roman letters, as cold water for cold *water*, 10, 42. They italicize forms inserted to remove an ambiguity in the Greek, as in 3, 15; 5, 37; 6, 13; or to remove an ambiguity from an English form, as in 9, 19. They italicize a preposition when they repeat it, where the Greek uses it only once; but they do not italicize it, when they repeat it as denoting the mere case of a Greek word. But it is to be remarked that the Revisers do not practise nor profess strict consistency in this complicated matter. *the Christ*, after the Greek. The Greek often employs the article with the name of a person, as mentioned before, well known, and for other reasons; as, *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, 2, 1; 3, 13, etc., which, of course, does not admit of translation. And *Χριστός*, being often the title of our Lord, will take the article in English wherever it is used as a title; as, 16, 16; S. Mark 12, 35; S. Luke 2, 26 (where the English article does double duty), S. John 1, 20, and elsewhere; but where it seems to be a mere name, whether with or without the article in the Greek, the article should be omitted in translation, and it is omitted here by de Wette, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and the Germ. and the Holl. Rev. This use of the same word both as a title and as a mere name is harsh, and it would relieve the matter, wherever it seems to be used as a title, if it were translated after the Hebrew, *the Messiah*, or by the English, *the Anointed*. But even *ὁ Μεσσίας* is rendered by *Χριστός* without the article in S. John 1, 42, and in the only other passage in which it occurs, S. John 4, 25, it is itself without the article. — v. 18. *When*, after Wycl. and the rest except A. V. *When as*; so Ecclesiasticus, Prol. This is a double form like *while as*, which the Rev. have allowed to stand in Heb. 9, 8, and *what time as* in Ps. 105, 13 Cranmer, and the familiar *whereas*. *When as* seems to occur more frequently in poetry than in prose; as, in Shaksp. M. V. v. 999, and eight times in all; and in Herrick's Noble Numbers, Lond. 1859, p. 524, and four times in all. It is found in prose in Selden, T. T. p. 9; and in Walton's Angler, p. 55. *had been betrothed*, nearly after Tynd. and Gen., was betrothed; was espoused, A. V.; was spousid, Wycl. and Rh. — v. 19. *And*, after Wycl.; Then,



A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *righteous*, after Cran.; *rightful*, Wycl.; just, A. V. after Gen. and Rh. — v. 20. *when he thought*; while he thought, A. V. after Wycl., and so substantially all the rest. But the aorist stands here in the Greek, denoting a precedent action, and therefore it should be rendered, when he had thought on these things, or with Dean Alford, while (better, when) he was thus purposed; in Acts 10, 13 we have this verb in the present (*ἐνθυμούμενος*), and there the Rev. properly follow A. V., while Peter thought. The aorist participle is always to be rendered, in Hellenistic as well as in classical Greek, as a past form except where the exigency of the case requires a present; as in the frequent *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε* 3, 15; 4, 4, etc., which interchanges with *ἀπεκρίθη λέγων* 25, 9; S. Mark 15, 9; S. Luke 4, 4; S. John 1, 26; or where the loose use of the English present participle may well enough represent the Greek aorist, as 19, 26 *ἐμβλέψας*, an aorist, and Acts 1, 11 *βλέποντες*, the present, both of which A. V. and the Rev. give by the present, looking. *an angel*, after the Greek; the angel, A. V. and all the rest. — v. 21. *it is he that*, by a new and free rendering to bring out the emphatic *αὐτός*, which the simple *he* of A. V. and all the rest seems adequately to express, as in 3, 11; 8, 24; 14, 2; 16, 20; 21, 27; it might have been rendered by *himself*, used absolutely, as in 8, 17 *Himself* took our infirmities, and S. John 4, 53; 5, 20; Heb. 13, 5 and often elsewhere, which is a thoroughly English use of the pronouns; see Life of Davison, pp. 240, 289 *himself*, absolute; pp. 238, 337 *herself*; p. 327 *myself*; Sir Philip Sidney's *Psalms* of David, p. 162 *myself*; p. 163 *thysself*; and Pref. of A. V., p. 116 a. — v. 22. *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken*; A. V. after Cran., Gen. and Rh. and so Dean Alford; that it *schulde* be fulfillid that, etc., Wycl.; to fulfill that which was spoken, Tynd. and 1st Gen. This form was found also in A. V. in 2, 15; 2, 23; 8, 17; 12, 17; 21, 4; 27, 35 (now rejected from the text), and has been retained by the Rev., and 13, 35 (*it—that*) has been conformed to the others. In 2, 17 and 27, 9, A. V. had, then was fulfilled that which, etc. The pronoun *it* is regularly either enclitic or proclitic, and therefore should not be used, as it is not except very rarely, as simple antecedent to a relative, or where it would take an emphasis. Cases like, *he it is that*, S. John 14, 21; Ps. 108, 13, and, *It is this which*, South's Sermons, III. p. 204; 'tis false which they charge the Bishops with, Selden, T. T. p. 28; present no difficulty, as the emphasis does not fall on the word *it*. A better rendering here therefore would be, that that might be fulfilled which was

spoken, as Mr. Darby gives it. This form, in its various senses, occurs now and then; as, to receyve that that shalbe shewyd him, Ellis, Original Letters, I. pp. 241, 248; here is that that causeth the offence, Life of Davison, p. 323; as for that that is said, Selden, T. T. p. 99; and so, I answered that that needed not, Life of Davison, p. 247; so A. V. and the Rev. allow, we remember that that deceiver said, in 27, 63; S. John 21, 23; and the Rev. have even introduced it into Heb. 12, 13, that that which is lame, etc. There are, however, instances of the form we have criticized, in which this pronoun can hardly be read without emphasis; as, but on whomsoever it shall fall, 21, 44; as for the light of mine eyes, it also is gone, Ps. 38, 10; to be bound unto it and none other, Bp. Bancroft at the Conference after the accession of James I.; to bury it and them, Walton's Angler, p. 224; to get money out of other Mens Pockets, and it into their own, Selden, T. T. p. 107; owing to that cause and to it alone, Spedding's Rev. etc. p. 74;—the natural intellect of man. It, too, grows, even in the most uneducated, Liddon's Univ. Sermons, p. 122. —v. 23. *the virgin*, after the Greek; a virgin, Wycl. and all the rest (that mayde, 1st Gen.) *which is, being interpreted*, a change of order to conform to Acts 4, 36; which being interpreted is, A. V. after Rh., which seems better, as bringing the verb directly before its predicate. —v. 24. *And* (δέ), after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., 1st Gen., and Rh.; Then, A. V. after 2d Gen. *arose*, after Wycl., roos. *his sleep* (τοῦ ὕπνου), the article in such case being equivalent to an unemphatic possessive pronoun, a fact which A. V. did not recognize, and therefore when they employed the possessive under such circumstances it is italicized; as, *our* sicknesses (τὰς νόσους) 10, 17; *thy* cloke (τὸ ἱμάτιον) 5, 40; 9, 5 (where the text is now changed); *his* hand (τὴν χεῖρα) 8, 3; 8, 20; 10, 24; *their* nets (τὰ δίκτυα) 4, 20, and so often elsewhere. *commanded* (Greek aorist), after Wycl. and Rh.; had bidden, A. V. after Cran.; this is one of the few instances in which the Rev. have made a pure English word give place to a Latin or a Romance word, and here for the sake of dignity. The pluperfect is more exact in this passage, and Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dean Alford have employed it here, as the Revisers themselves have done in 26, 1; 26, 57; 27, 31, 35 and elsewhere. —v. 25. *and*: so A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. There can be no doubt that the Heb. ׀, used with a loose simplicity not only for *and*, but also where more cultivated languages employ *and yet*, *but*; *for*, *therefore*; *that* (both final and demonstrative), etc., gave a coloring to καὶ in the LXX. and in the N. T.; and the more precise

word here would be *but*, as the 2d Gen., Dr. Campbell, and Dr. Second give it. This fact is recognized more frequently by A. V. than by the Revisers, who have even obscured some passages by neglecting it, as 11, 19 and S. Luke 7, 35. *a son*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; her first-born son, A. V. and so the Germ. and the Holl. Rev.

CH. II. v. 1. *wise men from the east came*, by a change of order; there came wise men from the east, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest, and so de Wette, and the Germ. and the Holl. Rev. — v. 2. *saw*, after the Greek aorist; have seen, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. The Rev. make it a point generally to render the Greek aorist tense by the English imperfect, and the Greek perfect by the English perfect, and in many instances this gives a more exact and better representation of the original, but it sometimes sacrifices the English idiom to the Greek. — v. 3. *And* (δε), rendering the particle after Rh., which A. V. and the rest omit. *it*: supplied by the Rev. but not italicized; see on 1, 17; *these things*, supplied by A. V. after Cran. — v. 4. *gathering together*, after Gen.; when he had gathered, A. V. after Cran.; inquired, after Rh.; demanded, A. V. after Cran. *the Christ*, after the Greek and as a title; see on 1, 17; Christ, A. V. and all the rest. — v. 6. *land of Judah*, after Wycl. and Rh., which both insert the article; *in* the land of Judah, A. V., neglecting to italicize the article, after Tynd. *in no wise least*, closer to the Greek, after Mr. Darby; not the least, A. V. and all the rest. *shall come forth*, closer to the Greek, after Rh. and substantially Wycl.; shall come, A. V. after Tynd. *a governor, which*: by a new rendering; that, A. V. and all the rest. The propriety of continuing to use *which* of persons in our English Bible has been called in question especially in this country, where it strikes the generality of the people not so much as an archaism as a mark of ignorance. This use would naturally be less offensive to the common people of Great Britain. But let us inquire into the actual use of *which* in this way in some good English taken at random of the century preceding the A. V. of 1611, of the time of the A. V., and of the century following.

Of Ellis' Original Letters, in 236 pp. 12mo, of state papers and letters of distinguished persons in the early part of the reign of Henry VIII, we find *which* used of persons 32 times only, and in the 21 instances in which reference is made to God and the Persons of the Holy Trinity, *which* is employed once only.

In Sir Harris Nicolas' Life of William Davison, Secretary to

Queen Elizabeth, we find in 166 pp. 8vo. of documents, *which* used of persons 8 times only.

In the Preface to the A. V. of 1611, making 16 pp. 4to in Dr. Scrivener's edition (in amount about equal to two-thirds of S. Matt.), we find *which* used of persons 3 times only.

In Walton's Angler, making 246 pp. 12mo, we find *which* used of persons 8 times only.

Of Dryden's famous prose, in the *Epistle Dedicatory* to the *Rival Ladies*, in the *Epistle Dedicatory* to the *Essay on Dramatick Poetry*, and in the *Essay* itself, these pieces making in all 129 pp. 8vo. in Malone's edition, we find *which* used of persons twice only.

We will add the usage in this particular of three poetical works of about the last half of the 16th, and the first half of the 17th century.

In *The Psalmes of David translated into Verse by Sir Philip Sidney and the Countess of Pembroke, his Sister*, 43 in number and making 111 pp. 12mo, we find *which* used of persons only twice.

Shakspeare indeed used *which* of persons, but in his Julius Caesar, which we chanced to take for this examination, we did not find *which* used of persons in a single instance; for *armies which*, IV 2, is a case of *which* referring to a collective noun, and this is a common modern as well as ancient usage.

In Herrick's *Noble Numbers*, making 105 pp. 12mo, we find *which* used of persons only once.

Now in the Revision of St. Matt., which makes only about 46 pp. 12mo, we find *which* used of persons 58 times, and of these instances 23 are of God or of the Persons of the Holy Trinity, 4 of these 58 being added by the Revisers, making more than one case of this use of *which* to a page; while in the old English adduced above, making in all 1081 pp. 4to, 8vo, and 12mo, we find *which* used of persons only 52 times or once in about 2.1 pp. So that had the Revisers of 1611 never in a single instance used *which* of persons in their work, the absence of it would scarcely have occasioned remark in comparison with the best English of one hundred years before their time, of their own time, or of one hundred years after; and such being the case, ought this frequent use of it in the Revision of 1881 to be regarded as justifiable? — v. 7. *privily called*, after Tynd. and Gen.; when he had *privily called*, A. V. after Cran. *lernyde*, Wycl. and Rh.; enquired, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *carefully*, by a new rendering; diligently, A. V. after Tynd., but this word is now obsolete in this

sense. — v. 8. *bring me word*, after Tynd.; *bring me word again* (*i. e.* make reporte to me, Rh.) after Cran., which more fully gives the Greek (ἀπαγγέλλω, not ἀγγέλλω). *that I also may come and worship him*, to keep closer to the order of the Greek (καγώ); that I may come and worship him also, A. V. after Tynd., but not by oversight. *Also* stands directly after and directly before its word; as, after, 5, 39; 5, 40; 10, 33, etc.; before, 12, 45, etc.; but it has a certain freedom of position, as here, and the Revisers themselves have allowed it elsewhere; as 6, 14; 6, 21, etc.; compare Fox's History, p. 382, Upon the Duke of York's return, Monmouth thought he might without blame return also, for *he also*; then indeed St. Paul's preaching was vain and our<sup>s</sup> faith is vain also, for *our faith also*, Bp. Lightfoot, Pref. to Com. on Gal. — v. 9. *And they, having heard the king, went their way*, after Rh. nearly, Who, having heard the king, went their way; When they had heard the king, they departed, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 10. *And when*, after Gen.; When, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. omitting the particle (δέ). — v. 11. *And they came into the house*, after Wycl. nearly, and thei entriden in to the hous; And when they were come into the house, A. V. by a new rendering. *opening their treasures they offered*, after Rh.; when they had opened their treasures, they presented, A. V. after Wycl. nearly. — v. 12. *of God*, in italics, which are omitted by A. V., and so in v. 22; see on 1, 17. — v. 13. *Now*, by a new rendering; And, A. V. after Wycl. *an angel*, after the Greek, and so Rh.; the angel, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *until I tell thee*, after Rh. nearly, until I shal tel the. — v. 14. *And he arose and took*, after Rh. nearly, Who arose, and tooke; When he arose, he took, A. V. after Tynd. — v. 15. *Did I call*, after the Greek (aorist), by a new rendering; have I called, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; see on v. 2. — v. 16. *The male children*, to mark the gender of the Greek (τοὺς παῖδας), after Gen. and Rh.; the children, A. V. after the rest. The Greek expression in itself, like *nati* in Latin, and even *pueri* in the Old Latin, might include both sexes. de Wette observes the distinction here; the Germ. Rev. and the Holl. disregard it. *borders*, after Rh.; coasts, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *Jeremiah*; see on 1, 3. — v. 18. *A voice was heard in Ramah*, after Rh. nearly, A voice in Ramah was heard; In Ramah was there a voice heard, A. V. nearly after Gen. *weeping and great mourning*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; lamentation and weeping and great mourning, A. V. *because they are not*, after the Greek (ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶ), after Wycl.



and Rh. ; but better, because they were not, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., by attraction into the past tense, which the Revisers themselves commonly use in such cases ; as *was* (ἦν) 16, 20 ; *was passing by* (παράγει) 20, 30 ; *was coming* (ἔρχεται) 24, 43, and often elsewhere. — v. 20. *they are dead that*, after Wycl. and Rh. ; they are dead which, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. This is one of the few cases wherein the Rev. have given up the use of *which* of persons. — v. 22. *and*, after Wycl. and Rh. ; notwithstanding, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. *he withdrew*, by a new rendering ; he turned aside, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 23. *that he should be called a Nazarene*, after Gen. ; and so de Wette, Dr. Noyes, Dr. Davidson, and Weizsäcker ; or equally well, He shall be called a Nazarene, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran.

CH. III. v. 1. *And in these days*, after Gen. and Rh. ; In those days, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., and Cran., who neglect the particle (δέ). *saying*, by a change of text after Lachmann and Tischendorf ; And saying, A. V. — v. 3. *Isaiah* : Esaias, A. V. ; see on 1, 3. *Isaiah the prophet*, by a change of order to conform to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh. *make ye ready*, after Wycl. ; prepare ye, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 4. *Now John himself*, by a new and exact rendering ; And the same John, a new rendering of A. V., which here and sometimes elsewhere treats the Greek pronoun (αὐτός) with inexactness. *food*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dr. Davidson ; *meat*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 5. *unto him* ; to him, A. V. and all the rest ; *unto* improves the sound. *Jordan*, after A. V. and all the rest ; the Jordan, after the Greek, Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson. This omission of the article with the name of a river has been quite obsolete for a long period. We have observed the following in regard to this matter. In the 16th century, in Ellis' Original Letters I. pp. 146, 147 *bis Themys* (Thames) is found ; in the 17th century, in Walton's Angler, this form is found three times in all : *Trent*, p. 131 ; *Severn*, p. 188 ; *Thames*, p. 135 ; but, *the Thames*, p. 85 ; in Maundrell's Journey it is found 8 times in all : *Eleutherus*, pp. 24, 25 ; *Adonis*, p. 36 ; *Casimeer*, p. 47 ; *Jordan*, pp. 80 *bis*, 82, 83 ; while in Dryden's Prose and in Sir William Temple, the present writer has noted only the form with the article ; as, Dryden, I. p. 35, *the Thames*, and again p. 36 ; Temple I. p. 69, *the Rhine*, and so on pp. 77, 103, 114 *bis* ; and a single page of Gibbon (Decline and Fall, etc., Lond. 1854, ch. I. p. 157) gives us the following : *the Tagus, the Rhine, the Po, the Adige, and the Tiber*. Nor have

the Revisers been consistent in their own use. While this word in the Greek Testament (as well as in the Hebrew Bible with only two exceptions easy to be explained) always has the article, the Revisers have omitted it here and in 4, 15; 4, 25; 19, 1; S. Mark 3, 8; 10, 1; S. Luke 3, 3; S. John 1, 28; 3, 26; 10, 40; but have retained it in 3, 13; S. Mark 1, 9; and S. Luke 4, 1.—v. 7. *coming*, after the Greek, and so Wycl. and Rh.; come, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *Ye offspring of vipers*, after Dr. Campbell; O generation, etc., A. V. after Tynd. *warned*, after the Greek aorist; so Wycl., *shewide*; hath warned, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 2, 2.—v. 8. *fruit worthy of*, after Rh. and substantially after Wycl.; fruits meet for, A. V. by a new rendering.—v. 9. *our father*, supplying *our* but not italicizing it; *our father*, A. V.; see on 1, 17.—v. 10. *even now*, after Tynd., Cran. and 1st Gen.; and now also, A. V. after 2d Gen. *every tree therefore*, after Rh. to preserve more closely the order of the Greek; therefore every tree, A. V. after Wycl.—v. 11. *with the Holy Ghost and with fire*, repeating the preposition, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., and italicizing it after A. V. The preposition where expressed as here only once may of course be repeated or not according to the exigency of the passage. In this passage the repetition adds dignity, and well suits 5, 25, but in 5, 45 it seems properly omitted by the Rev. against A. V.—v. 12. *is*, supplied, but not italicized; *is*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. *thoroughly*, after A. V.; it does not appear why this quite obsolete spelling should be retained when our modern form thoroughly as well as throughly is found in A. V. Throughly is found twice in the O. T., Ex. 21, 9 and 2 K. 11, 18; and thoroughly is found in the 15th century, Nicolas' Journal of Beckington a. 1442, p. 20. *cleanse his threshing-floor*, by a new rendering; nearly after Wycl., *clense his corn flore*; purge his floor, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Rh. *the chaff he will burn up*, by a change of order to keep closer to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; he will burn up the chaff, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.—v. 13. *the Jordan*, after the Greek; Jordan, A. V. omitting the article, after Wycl. and the rest; see on v. 5.—v. 14. *John would have hindered* (the Greek tentative imperfect), after Dr. Davidson; John forbad, A. V. after Wycl.—v. 15. *Suffer it now*, with the marginal, *Or me*; *Suffer it to be so now*, A. V. after Tynd., Let it be so now, and Rh., *Suffer me at this time*. *he suffereth*, by a new rendering after the Greek; he suffered, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest.—v. 16. *from the water*, after the Greek (*ἀπό*) and Wycl.; out

of the water, A. V. inexactly after Tynd. and the rest. *as a dove*, closer to the Greek (ὡσεὶ) after Wycl. and Rh.; like a dove, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *coming*, a literal rendering of the Greek after Wycl. and Rh.; *lighting*, A. V. and the rest, which is a technical rendering and followed by Dr. Campbell. — v. 17. *out of the heavens*, close to the Greek (ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν) by a new rendering; from heaven, A. V. and all except Wycl., from hevenes. *in whom I am well pleased*, after Cran., Gen., Rh., and A. V.; in whom is my delyte, Tynd.; in quo mihi complacui, Vulg.; in which Y have plesid to me, Wycl.; in whom I have found my delight, Mr. Darby. We have here a Greek aorist, not present, and the phrase occurs without variation of tense in 12, 18; 17, 5; S. Mark 1, 11; S. Luke 3, 22; 2 Pet. 1, 17; and in all these passages also the Revisers translate the past tense by a present. But Meyer, the greatest of the German commentators, and some others, regard it here as a real past and would so translate it, *in whom I was well pleased, in whom I found delight*, considering it as said in reference to the Son's assumption of the Mediatorial office, as distinguished from the love which naturally enters into our conception of the mutual relation of Paternity and Sonship (Dr. Addison Alexander on this place). Compare the aorists also in our Lord's discourses of his relation to the Father; as, ἡγάπησέ με ὁ πατήρ, S. John 15, 9; 17, 23, 26; ἤκουσα *ib.* 15, 15; ἔδωκας, *ib.* 17, 2, 8; ἐσφράγισεν, *ib.* 6, 27.

CH. IV. v. 3. *And the tempter came and said*, after Wycl. nearly, And the tempter cam nyge and seide; And when the tempter came to him, he said, A. V. after Cran. *If thou art the Son of God*, after the Greek (indicative, not subjunctive), and Wycl., if thou art Goddis sone; if thou be, etc., A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. The Revisers have made it a special point in their work to distinguish between the Greek indicative mood and the subjunctive, but in the following cases in S. Matt. they have left the subjunctive of A. V.: 6, 23, if the light that is in thee be darkness; 14, 28, Lord, if it be thou; 26, 63, whether thou be the Christ; though the indicative stands in the Greek. The numerous changes by the Revisers of the subjunctive to the indicative have given a modern tinge to their work, as the subjunctive from the circumstance that it can be distinguished only in a few forms, as *is—be, has—have, was—were*, and the third person singular of the present, has become greatly disused, and even the distinction between *was* and *were*, which is often very important, has been disregarded not unfrequently by eminent English writers. The

tendency among the old writers to use the subjunctive after certain particles, without strict reference to the thought, is well known, but we will instance in a single writer, Walton. In the *Angler* we found *if* with the subjunctive 34 times, with the indicative 5 times; *unless* with the subjunctive 10 times, with the indicative not once; *except* with the subjunctive once, but not with the indicative; *though* with the subjunctive 8 times, with the indicative 5 times; *whether* with the subjunctive 3 times, but not with the indicative; *till* with the subjunctive 4 times, and *until* once; *till* with the indicative 4 times. *become*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; be made, A. V. after Wycl and the rest. — v. 5. *taketh him*, after the Greek and Wycl. (took, and so 2d Gen.); *taketh him up*, A. V. freely after Cran. *he set*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *he setteth*, A. V. *the pinnacle*, after the Greek, and so Wycl. and Rh.; a *pinnacle*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest, who neglect the definite article. — v. 6. *If thou art*, etc., after the Greek and Wycl.; *If thou be*, etc., A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on v. 3. *on*, by a new and exacter rendering of the Greek (*ἐν*); *in*, A. V. after Wycl. and Rh. *their*, supplied after Tynd. and the rest except Wycl., but not italicized; *their*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. *in hondis*, Wycl. *haply*, by a new rendering, but substantially after Wycl., peraventure, and Rh., perhaps; at any time, A. V. after Cran. and Gen. — v. 7. *Again it is written*, change of order to conform to the Greek; *It is written again*, A. V. after Cran. and Gen. — v. 8. *the devil taketh him*; *taketh him up*, A. V. after Tynd. (toke hym up) and Cran. *unto*, after Gen.; *into*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 9. *he said*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *he saith*, A. V. after Cran. — v. 10. *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God*, after A. V. and the rest except Rh., which preserves the more forcible Greek order, *The Lord thy God shalt thou worship*; so the Vulgate. — v. 12. *when he*, by change of text after Tischendorf and Tregelles; *when Jesus*, A. V. This is a variation which we often meet with, the proper name having been introduced into the Lectionary for the sake of perspicuity, as in the case of our own Liturgical books. *was delivered up*, after Rh.; *was cast into prison*, A. V. by a new and free rendering. *he withdrew*, by a new rendering; *he retired*, Rh.; *he departed*, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. The Revisers have in many cases, as here, substituted pure English words for Latin or Romance words; as in 8, 3; 20, 34; 26, 74; and so *mindest* for *savourest* 16, 23; *lead*

*astray* for deceive 24, 4; and *hearing* for *audience*, S. Luke, 20, 45; and again archaic for common forms; as, *must needs come* for *must come* 24, 6; *he repented himself* for he repented 21, 29; *thrice* for *three times* Acts 11, 10. — v. 13. *by the sea*, after Wycl. nearly, beside the sea; upon the sea coast, A. V. after Cran. — v. 13. *Zebulun and Naphtali*; see on 1, 3. — v. 15. *Toward the sea*, by a new rendering, the Rev. supplying, but not italicizing the preposition; *by the way of the sea*, A. V. after Cran.; see on 1, 17. *beyond Jordan*, the Greek article being omitted after Wycl. and the rest; see on 3, 5. *a great light*, by a new rendering; great light, without the article Wycl. and the rest. *To them did light spring up*, by a new and more exact rendering; light is risen to them, Rh.; light is sprung up, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest, who omit the pronoun (*àvρoῖς*). — v. 17. *began Jesus*, new and improved order after the Greek; Jesus began, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *Repent ye*, by an insertion of the subject after Wycl. as in 3, 2; Repent, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. The subjective pronoun of the imperative mood, as well as of the other finite forms, is often not expressed in Greek, but its insertion sometimes adds dignity as here, sometimes earnestness, sometimes marks emphasis or contrast, and sometimes gives a pleasing fulness to the expression. — v. 18. *he saw*, by change of reading after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; Jesus—saw, A. V.; see on v. 12. *Simon who is called Peter*, after Rh. and more close to the Greek; so substantially all but A. V., by a new rendering, Simon, called Peter. — v. 19. *Come ye after me*, closer to the Greek after Wycl. and Rh.; Follow me, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 20. *the nets*, after the Greek; so Wycl., Cran., Gen., and Rh.; *their nets*, A. V. after Tynd. and 1st Gen.; see on 1, 24. — v. 21. *other two brethren*, archaic order after A. V. and the rest except Wycl. who gives us the modern order, *tweyne othere britheren*. The Revisers have retained the archaic order also in 25, 16, 20, *other five*; 25, 17, *other two*; but in 25, 22 they have changed the *two other* of A. V., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. into *other two*. In the old language we often find *other* also before the noun and article; as, all other the creditors, Life of Davison, p. 224; others the commissioners, *ib.* pp. 231, 242. — v. 21. *from thence*, A. V. after Tynd. and all the rest. The Rev. have done well in retaining, on occasion, this pleonastic form, found also in *from hence*, *from henceforth*, and *from whence*, which interchange with the simple forms *hence*, *thence*, *henceforth*, and *whence*, in the best English of all periods; *from hence*, Dryden, Dram. Poesy, p. 70; Temple, I.



54; *from thence*, Dryden, Dram. Poesy, pp. 91 and 152; Temple, I. p. 67; Bentley's Sermons, p. 292; Addison, Spect. No. 74, who rarely uses these forms; *from whence*, Dryden, Dram. Poesy, p. 64. With these forms we may compare the Latin *abhinc, dehinc, deinde, exinde*, and the English *hitherto*, which is formed after the same analogy. *the son*, correctly after the Greek, son only being italicized; the son, A. V. ~~the~~ *boat*, by a new and exact rendering; a ship, A. V. after Wycl., Gen., and Rh.; Tynd. and Cran. preserve the article. — v. 22. *straightway*, by a new rendering by a pure English word; see on v. 12; *furtherwith*, Rh.; immediately, A. V. after Cran. *the boat*; the ship, A. V.; see on v. 21. — v. 23. *in all Galilee*, by a change of text after Tischendorf and Tregelles; all Galilee, A. V. — v. 24. *the report of him*, by a new rendering; the bruit of him, Rh.; his fame, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *went forth into all Syria*, by a new and more exact rendering; wente in to al Sirie, Wycl. and Rh.; went throughout all Syria, A. V. by a new rendering. *all that were sick*, by a more exact rendering, nearly after Wycl. and Rh.; all sick people, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *holden*, by a new rendering; that were taken, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *possessed with devils* (δαιμονιζομένων), after A. V., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; hem that hadden feendis, Wycl.; such as were possest, Rh. We find in the Greek Testament διάβολος, a *supernatural wicked spirit*, and in this sense always in the singular number and almost always with the definite article, and this Dr. Noyes translates and prints *the Devil*. We find also δαιμόνιον, a *demon* or *evil spirit*, δαιμονιώδης, *like a demon* (adj.), and δαιμονίζομαι, *to be possessed with a demon*. Some learned scholars think that these words ὁ διάβολος, δαιμόνιον, etc., should thus be carefully distinguished. But Wycliffe interchanged them; as (ὁ διάβολος), 4, 1 *the feend*; but 25, 41 *the devel*; (δαιμόνιον) 7, 22 *feendis*, but 9, 33 *devel*; (δαιμονιώδης) Jas. 3, 15 *feendli*; (δαιμονίζομαι) 4, 24 that hadden *feendis*, but 8, 16, that hadden *develis*. Luther, Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh. rendered all alike *devil*, *devilish*, possessed (*with devils*). Dean Alford ignores the distinction, and so do the Revisers of 1881, de Wette, and the Revised German. But Dr. Campbell, Diss. VI. Pt. 1, insisted at great length on the distinction and carefully observed it himself in his translation of the Gospels, and he is followed in English by Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; the distinction is observed also in French by the Abbé Glaire and Dr. Segond, by the Holland Revision, and in German by Weizsäcker. *epileptic*, by a new word; those which were lunatic, A. V., substantially after Wycl.

and the rest. *palsied*, by a new form; those that had the palsy, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *great multitudes*, by a new and closer rendering of the Greek (ὄχλοι πολλοί); great multitudes of people, A. V. after Cran.; myche puple, Wycl. and Rh. *from Galilee and Decapolis and Jerusalem and Judaea and from beyond Jordan*, after the Rh., which supplies the preposition only before the last noun; A. V. supplies and italicizes the preposition with the last four nouns after Wycl. and the rest, and the effect is good; see on 3, 11. *Jordan*: so A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; see on 3, 5.

CH. V. v. 1. *the mountain*, after the Greek; a mountain, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest, omitting the definite article; an hil, Wycl. *had sat down*, after the Greek, and so Dr. Noyes; was set, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 3. *are*, supplied, but not italicized, and so vv. 4–10; *are*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. — v. 3. *theirs*, after the form of the 1st ed. of A. V.; their's, in the later editions; so *ours*, *yours*, *hers* for *our's*, *your's*, *her's*. — v. 6. *they that*, after Wycl. and Rh.; they which, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen.; see on 2, 6. — v. 9. *sons*, after the Greek; children, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. — v. 10. *they that*, after Wycl. and Rh.; they which, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 2, 6. *have been persecuted*, after the Greek perfect; are persecuted, A. V., by a new rendering; suffren persecusioun, Wycl. and the rest; see on 2, 2. — v. 11. *reproach*, by a new rendering; revile, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest except Wycl., curse. *say*, after Rh. omitting the auxiliary *shall* of A. V. after Tynd. This omission, a change well made in several places by the Revisers, gives a unity to the sentence. — v. 13. *if the salt have lost its savour*, by a new rendering, introducing a new form, here as well as elsewhere, on occasion, into the Revision; his savour, A. V. after Cran. and Gen.; hir saltness, Tynd. The form *its* does not occur in A. V. (of its own accord in Lev. 25, 5 is a modern change; in the original ed. of 1611 it stands, *of it owne accord*) nor in Spenser's works, is rare in Shakspeare and Bacon, more frequent in Milton, and had quite established itself in Dryden's time (Morris, Hist. Eng. Grammar, § 133). This is not quite correct as to Dryden. In about 120 pp. of Vol. I. that we examined we found *its* 11 times and *its own* 5 times, but *his* for *its* occurs on p. 86. In about 100 pp. of South, who was of the same period as Dryden, we found *its* 23 times, but no case of *his* for *its*. *His* in the Old English was the possessive masculine and neuter (comp. the Greek αὐτοῦ, *his*, *its*, and the Latin ejus, *his*, *hers*, *its*) and *her* feminine; and *his* and *her* did duty for the modern *its*, as *his* in this passage.

We find the interchange of *his* and *her* in S. Matt. 24, 32 *his branch*, and S. Mark 13, 28 *her branch*, and *her* again used with *it* in 1 Cor. 13, 5 *itself—her. and trodden*, a new form for the sake of unity; see on v. 11; and to be trodden, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh. — v. 14. *a hill*, new form in accordance with good modern usage; an *hill*, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen., the form *an* before *h* being common down through the 17th century. — v. 15. *lamp*, by a new and unnecessary rendering; candle, A. V. after Tynd. and all except Wycl., *lanterne. the bushel*, after the Greek; a bushel, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest, omitting the definite article. *the stand*, by a new rendering; a candlestick, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *shineth*, by a new rendering to conform it to the next verse; giveth light, A. V. after Wycl. and Cran. — v. 16. *Even so let your light shine*, by change of order after Wycl. and Rh., and by supplying *Even* without italicizing it; Let your light so shine—that, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 17. *came*, to preserve the Greek aorist, and so Wycl.; am come, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; see on 2, 2. *came*, as before. — v. 18. *pass away—pass away*, by a new and exact rendering; pass—pass, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., and Rh. *all things be accomplished: all things* after Wycl. and Gen., *be accomplished*, by a new rendering; all be fulfilled, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Rh. — v. 19. *one of these least commandments*, after Wycl. and the rest; so Meyer, Dean Alford, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, Dr. Segond, and the Germ. Rev.; one of these commands even the least, de Wette and Dr. Davidson, and so substantially Weizsäcker; one of the least of these commands, Sir John Cheke and the Holl. Rev. By *these least commands*, our Lord means, according to Meyer, what he had just designated by *one jot or one tittle*, and if this be so, the Revisers are right; and so the Vulg. without ambiguity, *unum de mandatis istis minimis*. Two passages in the Gospels closely connect themselves with this: 25, 40 *ἐν τοῦτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων*, and 25, 45 *ἐν τοῦτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων*; the former of which is rendered by A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., one of the least of these my brethren; and the latter, one of the least of these, but the Vulg. by an unambiguous form excludes this second partitive construction from each, *uni ex his fratribus meis minimis* and *uni de minoribus his*, and the Rev., after Wycl. and Rh., follow the Vulg. It must not be imagined that the order of the words settles the construction in these passages; for we find the partitive genitive intermediate in 7, 9 *τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος*—; and before it in S. Luke 5, 6, *ἰχθύων*

πλῆθος, and 9, 17; 13, 21; and in S. John 1, 35 ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο, and 6, 70; 6, 71; 9, 16; 12, 42, and 18, 9; and this order is not unfrequent in classic Greek; as, τῶν ὀπλιτῶν τὸ πλῆθος Xen. Anab. 5, 2, 21; Thuc. 6, 35; τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοὺς ἀχρειοτάτους Thuc. 2, 6. *shall be called*, by a new rendering; he shall be called, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., *he* not being expressed in the Greek in this clause, but it is expressed in the last clause of the verse. *them*, added but not italicized; *them*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. *he*, after Rh. (οὗτος, expressed); the same, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. This old demonstrative, *the same*, the Rev. have well retained in many instances, have sometimes changed to *he*, etc., as here where either form might well stand, but have sometimes changed to the injury of the passage, as in 12, 50, which see. — v. 20. *the righteousness of the Scribes*, after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., supplying *the righteousness* and italicizing it, while in a similar passage, Acts 12, 20, they have supplied the noun, but have not italicized it; *that* of the Scribes, Rh., as the English idiom requires and as the Rev. have given in S. John 5, 36; sometimes the Greek expresses the noun twice and then it may be given in English, as in S. Luke 11, 51, from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah; and in S. John 12, 43, they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God, Rev. after A. V. and the rest. *in no wise* (οὐ μὴ), by a new rendering; *in no case*, A. V. which was the first to render this strengthened form at all. — v. 21. *it was said to them*, after Wycl. and the rest except A. V., which gave *by them*, by a new rendering, after Beza and others; but the Rev. here follow S. Chrysostom, Luther, Bengel, de Wette, Meyer and others, and this view is in accordance with the use of ῥηθῆναι τινι in the N. T. — v. 22. *every one who* (πᾶς ὁ—), closer to the Greek, after Wycl. nearly, *ech man that*; *whosoever*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *with his brother*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann and Tischendorf; *with his brother without a cause*, A. V. (Tregelles puts it in the margin). *and whosoever* (δεῖ), after Gen. and Rh.; but *whosoever*, A. V. after Wycl. (but he that), Tynd., and Cran., and to render this same particle in this and the preceding clause by *but* will bring out the opposition and climax here. *the hell of fire*, literally and awkwardly after Rh.; the fier of helle, Wycl.; hell fire (from A. S. helle fȳr, *fire of hell*), A. V. well after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and this phrase is used by Shaksp. H. IV. 3, 3, 36; H. V. 2, 3, 44. — v. 23. *If therefore thou art offering—and there rememberest*, with both verbs in the indicative

mood after Wycl. and Cran.; Rh. has both verbs in the subjunctive; if thou bring—and there rememberest, A. V. after Gen. with the first verb in the subjunctive and the second in the indicative, and this not by an error of grammar, as Canon Westcott supposed (Hist. Eng. Bible, p. 171), but by a change of conception. Instances of such change are by no means wanting in our older English: If he *be sent*—and he *finds*, etc., Selden, T. T. p. 118; If a constable *command* me—and *has* power to make me, etc., *ib.* p. 128; If it [the affair] *be* more intricate or *suffers* delay, Sir Wm. Temple, I. p. 124; though there *be* a vast distance between him and them, and they *are* to obey him, yet, etc., Selden, T. T. p. 53; though the preference *seem* decided—and it *is* capable of, etc., Sir Wm. Temple, I. p. 50; whether it *be*—whether this *has had*, South's Sermons, III. p. 358; and compare in Greek, εἴ τις ἡμύνετο, ἀλλ' εἴ τις—φαίνοντο, Xen. Ages. 11, 3 (Goodwin, Gr. Moods and Tenses, § 51, n. 3); ἢν ἐθέλωμεν—εἰ δὲ φοβησόμεθα, Isocr. Archid. § 107 (Goodwin, *ib.* § 50, n. 1.) *ought*, by a new form to remove the ambiguity of the form *ought*; *ought*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 25. *whiles*: so A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; and in Acts 5, 4 after A. V. by a new rendering. This is a very rare old genitive of the noun *while* used adverbially, as, for a while, 13, 21; after a while, 26, 73, etc., which is still common; so Chaucer, C. T. 35 (Harleian MS., Skeat); Pref. to Doway Bible; Bp. Hall's Sat. 2, 6 (1597); and according to Schmidt, Shaksp. Lex., used 19 times by Shaksp. including three cases of uncertain form; so also *otherwhiles*, Life of Davison, p. 353, and Shaksp. H. VI. 1, 2, 7; so the noun *way* gives the adverb *always*, *need* gives *needs* (M. Eng. *needes*), and *gate* (from the Danish gate, *way, manner*) gives *algates*, and also *othergates* (= otherwise), Shaksp. 12th N.V. 198; the preposition *beside* gives the adverb *besides*, and so A. V. properly distinguishes in the O. T. and N., and the Rev. follow them; as, the *preposition*: beside women and children, 14, 21; 15, 38; beside all this, Luke 24, 21, etc.; the *adverb*: besides, I know not, etc., 1 Cor. 1, 16; thou owest to me even thine own self besides, Philem. 19, which are the only two cases in the A. V. of N. T.; and the adjective *unaware* (it may be so taken in Sh. M. V. 823, 1116) gives the adverb *unawares*, Luke 21, 34 (A. V.); Heb. 13, 2. This suffix *s* therefore being properly the sign of the genitive and converting words into modifiers, ought not to be appended to words already modifiers as *afterward*, *henceforward*, *together* (comp. the old form *togethers*, Ellis, Original Letters, p. 328), nor to prepositions as such, as *toward*, *beside*, *among*



(comp. the old form *amonges*, Ellis, Original Letters, p. 361), etc. This principle, already fixed in the case of certain words and becoming settled in others, the Revisers have observed uniformly in S. Matt. except in 17, 49 *towards his disciples*, where we might suppose that they used this form as a mere matter of sound before *his*, but the examples, *toward Abraham*, S. Luke 1, 55; and *towards their own*, etc., 1 Tim. 5, 4, show that they did not make or at least did not carry out such a distinction. They seem to use the regular form *always* (18, 10; 26, 11 *bis*; 1 Thess. 1, 2; 2 Thess. 1, 11), and the less common and poetic form *alway* (28, 20; Acts 10, 2; Phil. 4, 4; 2 Thess. 1, 3; 2 Thess. 2, 13) without discrimination, but it would have been better to reserve *alway* for the more solemn passages as 28, 20, where they have well allowed it to stand after A. V. *in the way*: so A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; and so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; on the road, Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes; and the Revisers themselves have given *on the way* in S. Mark 16, 12; S. Luke 8, 14; 10, 4, and have even changed the parallel passage in S. Luke 12, 58 from *in the way* to *on the way*, but have left it here, and in 15, 32; 20, 17; S. Mark 10, 32; S. Luke 9, 57; 24, 32, 35. *In the way* was indeed formerly used as here; as, in my way to my Lord Chancellor, Life of Davison, p. 235; They may serve him well enough in the Way, but when he comes to Court, etc., Selden, T. T. p. 180; in his way from New Market, Fox's Hist. p. 388; in their road to New Market, *ib.* p. 385; but this form now is commonly used of an obstruction; as, the difficulties in the way of Burke's promotion, etc., Morley, Life of Burke, Lond. 1880, p. 139. We should have been glad therefore to see the Rev. change this and the other similar passages also to *on the way*, and they would have had even Elizabethan authority for it; having visited Mr. Secretary Walsingham on my way, Life of Davison, p. 262. *lest haply*, after Rh. nearly, lest perhaps; Wycl., lest peradventure; lest at any time, A. V. after Cran. — v. 26. *till thou have paid* (Greek subjunctive), after Tynd. and Cran.; till thou hast paid, A. V. after Gen.; see on 4, 3. *the last farthing*, after Wycl. and Rh.; the uttermost farthing, A. V. after the excellent rendering of Sir John Cheke. — v. 27. *Ye have heard that it was said*, with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, A. V. — v. 28. *every one that*, closer to the Greek ( $\pi\alpha\varsigma \delta$ —) and nearly after Wycl., everi man that; whosoever, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 29. *if thy right eye causeth thee to stumble*, by a new rendering with an

endeavor to keep the primary meaning of the Greek verb (*σκανδαλίζω*) in its secondary sense. The Greek verb signified properly *to cause to stumble*, pass., *to stumble*; and secondarily, *to give offence to*, *to offend*, pass., *to be offended*; and as a causative, *to make offend*, pass., *to be made to offend*; and A. V. has admirably and satisfactorily always rendered this word by these secondary meanings, only it does not distinguish, as for example in this passage, between the general meaning *to offend* and the causative *to make offend*, using the form *to offend* for both. The Revisers seem in this instance to forget that a secondary meaning may become primary, as was probably the case with this word and with the Latin *offendo*. The primary use of *offendo*, *to hit against*, very seldom occurred, and was perhaps commonly no more present to the minds of the Romans than it is to ours when we employ *to offend*. If this was the case with *σκανδαλίζω* also, the Revisers' new rendering is not only not a faithful representation of the Greek, but even a misrepresentation of it, to say nothing of its awkwardness in many passages. They have thus unfortunately changed the A. V. in S. Matt. also in 5, 30; 11, 6; 13, 21; 17, 27; 18, 6; 18, 8; 18, 9; 24, 10; and elsewhere in the N. T., but have fortunately left the A. V. unchanged in the following passages: S. Matt. 13, 57; 15, 12; 26, 31; 26, 33 *bis*; S. Mark 6, 3; 14, 27; 14, 29 (in Rom. 14, 21 *σκανδαλίζω* is now omitted from the Greek text). If thy right eye offend thee, A. V. after Tynd.; if thy right eye cause thee to offend, Gen. excellently, and so Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson. *cast it*; *cast it*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. *that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body be cast into hell*, by a new and excellent rendering to unify the sentence, and so in v. 30; see on v. 11; that one of thy members should perish, and not *that* thy whole body should be cast into hell, A. V. by a new rendering. — v. 30. *cast it*; A. V. *cast it*; see on 1, 17. — v. 31. *It was said* (Greek aorist), after Rh.; *It hath been said*, A. V. after Wycl.; see on 2, 2. *also*, a loose rendering after 2d Gen., Rh. and Germ. Rev.; the particle here (*δέ*) is omitted by A. V., Tynd., Cran., and 2d Gen., but retained and rendered *and* by Wycl., Dr. Noyes, and Dr. Davidson. — v. 32. *every one that putteth away*, by change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *whosoever shall put away*, A. V. after Gen. *maketh her an adulteress*, by a new rendering; *causeth her to commit adultery*, A. V. by a new rendering. *when she is put away*, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson nearly, when put away; that is divorced, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 34. *by the heaven*, after Mr. Darby, to preserve the Greek article,

but against English idiom; by heaven, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson. *the throne of God*, after Wycl., Rh., and Dr. Noyes, which better suits the dignity of the idea; God's throne, A. V. by a new rendering. — v. 35. *the footstool of his feet*, to keep close to the Greek after Rh. and Sir John Cheke; the stole of his feet, Wycl.; his footstool, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *nor*, by a new rendering; neither, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *by Jerusalem*, after A. V. and the rest; the preposition in the Greek in the other cases in vv. 34, 35, 36 is *ἐν*, but here *εἰς*, and the Vulgate renders them all by *per*, but here the marginal *toward* seems better; cf. LXX. 2 Chron. 6, 20, 21, προσεύχεται ὁ παῖς σου εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, that is, *toward the temple*; and Dan. 6, 10, of prayer *toward Jerusalem*; in relation to Jerusalem, Dr. Davidson. — v. 36. *for*, after Wycl. (*ὅτι*; quia, Vulg.); because, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 37. *speech*, after Dr. Davidson; communication, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *and whatsoever*, closer to the Greek (*δέ*) after Wycl. and Rh.; for whatsoever, A. V. freely after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *is of the evil one*; the Revisers here and in v. 39 and 6, 13 render the ambiguous forms τοῦ πονηροῦ, τῷ πονηρῷ as personal instead of abstract, putting the abstract in the margin. Many scholars regret this action of the Revisers and wish that the old rendering might have stood undisturbed with the new rendering in the margin; is of yvel, Wycl. and Rh.; cometh of evil, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 39. *Resist not*, by a free rendering after Gen.; that ye resist not, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran. *him that is evil*, after Wycl., anyvel man; evil, A. V. after Cran. and Rh.; see on v. 37. — v. 39. *smiteth*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; shall smite, A. V. — v. 40. *would go to law with thee*, by a new rendering; will sue thee at the law, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *thy cloke* (τὸ ἱμάτιον); *thy cloke*, A. V. not recognizing the possessive force of the Greek article here; see on 1, 24. — v. 41. *one mile* (μῖλον ἓν), closer to the Greek after Rh.; a mile, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 44. *Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you*, etc., with an omission from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you, A. V. *them that*, after Rh.; hem that, Wycl.; them which, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; and so Dean Alford; them who, Dr. Campbell and Dr. Davidson; those who, Dr. Noyes and Mr.

Darby. The forms *he that*, *she that*, *they that*, and *him that*, with the personal pronoun used mostly as a demonstrative, are still common and perhaps not to be objected against, but *them that* seems to be avoided by writers of good taste. The Revisers have admitted this latter form 21 times into the Gospel of S. Matt., but might altogether have avoided it by using *those that* which was so much used by A. V. (*those that* occurs 7 times, and *them that* 8 times in the first twenty-five Psalms), which is found in the English of over four centuries ago; as, *thoo that (those that) toke the castel*, Journal of Beckington (1442), p. 100; and was the favorite form of Walton three centuries ago; as, Angler, pp. 9, 24, 33, 103, 129, 162, 187, while he admitted *them that* only once, p. 165; see on 2, 6. — v. 45. *sons*, close to the Greek by a new rendering; the *sones*, Wycl.; the *children*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *on the evil and the good—on the just and the unjust*, by a new rendering; on the evil and on the good—on the just and on the unjust, A. V. by a new rendering; on the *yvell* and on the good—on the *juste* and *unjuste*, Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen.; on the *evill* and the good—on the *just* and *unjust*, 2d Gen.; the Greek preposition is used only once in each phrase and the Revisers have well imitated this after Wycl. and Rh.; see on 3, 11; but the article is altogether omitted in the Greek, and so Wycl., on good and *yvel* men—on *just* men and *unjust*; and Rh., upon good and bad—upon *just* and *unjust*, which seems to be the best rendering ever given, the absence of the article in the Greek and the English heightening the idea of the indiscriminate goodness of God. — v. 47. *the Gentiles the same*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; the publicans so, A. V. — v. 48. *Ye shall therefore be*, close to the Greek after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; *Be ye therefore*, A. V. after Vulg., Wycl., and Rh., but with just the same force. *as*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; so Wycl. and 2d Gen.; even *as*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen.; as also, 2d Gen. *your heavenly Father*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and so Vulg., Wycl., and Rh.; *your Father* which is in heaven, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.

CH. VI. v. 1. *righteousness*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; so Wycl. after the Vulgate; *justice*, Rh.; *alms*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *else*, after Wycl.; otherwise, A. V. after Rh., which is fuller and more dignified. *with your Father*, close to the Greek (*παρὰ τῷ πατρί*), after Cran.

and Rh. — v. 2. *When therefore*, the Greek order, after Tynd. and 1st Gen.; Therefore when, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *alms*, close to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; *thine alms*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *sound not*, after Rh.; do not sound, A. V. by a new rendering. *They have received*, a free rendering after Wycl. and Rh. from the Vulgate, which renders the Greek ἀπέχουσι (*they have in full*) by *receperunt*; so vv. 5, 16; They have, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 4. *thy Father which*, after Tynd., Cran., Rh.; thi fadir that, Wycl. and Gen.; see on 2, 6. *shall recompense thee*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; so Wycl., schal quyte thee, and Rh., wil repay thee, after the Vulgate; himself shall reward thee openly, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen., only they neglect the αὐτός (*himself*). — v. 6. *when ye pray, ye*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; so the Vulgate, Wycl., Tynd., and Rh.; thou, when thou prayest, A. V. *to stand and pray*, by a free rendering after 2d Gen. and Rh.; to pray standing, A. V. close to the Greek after the Vulgate, Wycl., and 2d Gen.; to stand praying, Cran. by inversion. *in the corners*, after A. V., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; better, at the corners, Dr. Campbell. *thine inner chamber*, by a new rendering; chamber, Tynd., Cran., Gen., and Rh., and so Dr. Davidson, which gives the original (καπεῖον) adequately; thy closet, A. V. after Sir John Cheke, which is closer and seems the best possible rendering, and so Dr. Noyes, *closet* in old English meaning *an inner, more retired room*; as, in his Chamber or in his Closet, South's Sermons, III. p. 564; and regularly of the private apartment of the sovereign, as Life of Davison, p. 246. *and having shut*, after Rh.; and when thou hast shut, A. V. after Cran. and Gen. *thy Father which*, after Tynd. and all except Wycl., thi Fadir that; see on 2, 6. *shall recompense thee*, by omission from text, as in v. 4. — v. 7. *And in praying*, after Wycl. nearly, But in preiying; But when ye pray, A. V. after Cran., and *But* (δέ) here is perhaps more suitable than *And*. *the Gentiles do*, by a new rendering with *do* inserted but not italicized; see on 1, 17; the heathen *do*, A. V. after Wycl., 1st Gen. and the rest; as the heathen, 2d Gen. — v. 8. *Be not therefore*, by a new rendering with the omission of *ye* after the Greek; but the supplying of *ye* marks the contrast which really exists here, and it is well supplied by all the previous versions; see on 4, 17. — v. 9. *Our Father which*, after A. V., Tynd. and all the rest but Wycl., Oure Fadir that; see on 2, 6. — v. 10. *as in heaven, so on earth*, by a new and free rendering after the Greek order; so nearly Rh.,



and more literally, as in heaven, in earth also (ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς), with the old loose use of *in*; as in heaven, also on earth, Dr. Davidson; in earth, as *it is* in heaven, A. V. by a new rendering; on earth as it is in heaven, Dr. Noyes; in erthe as in hevene, Wycl.; as well in erth, as it ys in heven, Tynd. and Cran.; even in earth as *it is* in heaven, Gen.; all the old versions here except the Rheims have the order of A. V., which is the more common order of a comparison in English. The change of order here by the Revisers seems to be almost universally regretted. — v. 12. *as we also*, after the Greek; so 2d Gen. and Rh.; even as we, Tynd. and 1st Gen.; as we, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran., neglecting the καί. *we have forgiven*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; we forgive, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 13. *bring us*, by a new rendering of the Greek (εἰσφέρειν, not εἰσάγειν as in Luke 22, 54 and elsewhere); lead us, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest after the Vulgate, *inducas nos*. *the evil one*, after de Wette and Holl. Rev. and Dr. Davidson; evil, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; so Luther and Germ. Rev.; see on 5, 37. — v. 14. *For if ye forgive*, etc., with omission of the doxology from the text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulgate, only they have *Amen* from the Clementine edition, which is wanting in the *Codex Amiatinus*; the Holl. Rev., Dean Alford, Dr. Noyes, and Dr. Davidson omit the doxology, Dr. Campbell and Dr. Second enclose it in square brackets, but de Wette and the Germ. Rev. retain it; it has been traced back even to the 2d century in the Syriac and Thebaic versions, and Dr. Scrivener is not yet convinced that it should be rejected (Int. N. T. pp. 495 et seqq.) — v. 16. *may be seen of men*, after Tynd. and 1st Gen. nearly, might be sene of men; may appear unto men, A. V. after Rh.; might seem unto men, 2d Gen. — v. 17. *thy head*, after Rh.; thine head, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. The Revisers have treated the forms *my mine*, *thy thine* with great strictness throughout S. Matt., using *my* and *thy* before *consonants* and *h*; as, my son 1, 15; my house 12, 44 etc.; thy wife 1, 20; thy head 6, 17 etc.; and *mine* and *thine* before *vowels*; as, mine own 20, 15; thine adversary 5, 25 etc., with the single exception of *my oxen* 22, 4 (so also A. V.), which looks like an oversight on the part of A. V. and the Rev., as A. V. in the O. T. makes no exception of this word: thine ox Ex. 23, 12; Deut. 5, 14; 28, 31; thine oxen Ex. 20, 24; 22, 30. — v. 18. *be not seen of men*, after Wycl. nearly, be not seen—to men; appear not unto men, A. V. after Rh. nearly, appear not to men; seem not

unto men, Gen. *but of*, by a new rendering to agree with what precedes; but unto, A. V. *shall recompense thee*, by an omission from the text, as in v. 4; shall reward thee openly, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. — v. 19. *the earth*, by retaining the Greek article here against English idiom, after Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; earth, A. V. after Wycl. and Cran., and so Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dean Alford. *moth and rust doth*, after A. V., Wycl., and Cran. with the verb in the singular after a compound subject; but Tynd., Gen., and Rh. have the verb in the plural here, which accords with modern usage. For the singular verb here, compare also from A. V.: The rock of my strength and my refuge *is* in God, Ps. 62, 7; his right hand and his holy arm *hath* gotten him the victory, *ib.* 98, 1; and even with the double conjunction, both the inward thought of every one of them and the heart *is* deep, *ib.* 64, 6; from old English where it is common: reason and policy *commandeth*, etc., Life of Davison, p. 86; an act which God and the law *forbiddeth*, *ib.* p. 100; whose safety and greatness *has* been chiefly founded, etc., Sir Wm. Temple, I. p. 129; Blessing and happiness *was* thrust upon them, South's Sermons, III. p. 383; and from modern English where it is rare: the truth and delicacy of his sentiments *is* attended, etc., Spedding's Reviews, etc., p. 287; each and all of them *is* or may be realized perfectly, Liddon's Univ. Sermons, p. 211; all this and much else *appears* to forbid, etc., *ib.* p. 304. *consume*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, and Dr. Davidson; so nearly Wycl., *distrieth* (destroyeth); corrupt, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest; so Dean Alford; and so v. 20. *break through*, after A. V., Tynd., and Cran., with the marginal, dig through, after Gen. and Rh., which gives the Greek exactly (*διoppύσσεν*); so Wycl. nearly, *delven out*; and so v. 20. — v. 21. *thy treasure—thy heart*, by change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; so Wycl. and Rh. after the Vulgate; your treasure—your heart, A. V. — v. 22. *the lamp*, after Dr. Campbell, Dr. Noyes, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; the light, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; so Dean Alford. — v. 23. *the darkness*, close to the Greek after Dr. Campbell, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; that darkness, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; so Wycl., who had no article before him, rendered it of his own motion, *thilk prop. such*, afterward *that* derknessis, which is an evidence of its naturalness here. The Revisers themselves have rendered the article by the demonstrative; as, *that Mary*, etc. (*ἡ Μαρία*, etc.) S. John 11, 2; and the simple pronoun of the 3d person as a demonstrative; as, of those *works* (*αὐτῶν*) for of them, S. John 10, 32,

in both cases after A. V. A. V. also rendered the article by the demonstrative in 2 Thess. 2, 3, *that man* (*the man*, Rev.), and *ib.* 2, 8 *that wicked* (*the lawless one*, Rev.). — v. 24. *hold to one, and despise the other*, by a new and close rendering, the article in the Greek being omitted in the first clause; in the first part of the verse the article in the Greek is used in both clauses *the one—the other*; A. V. the one—the other, in both cases after Tynd. and all the rest except Wycl. the toon—the tother, with double article; so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby. and Dr. Davidson; one—the other, Dr. Campbell and Dr. Noyes in both cases, perhaps by oversight in the first. Both forms are well established in English and therefore the Revisers are justifiable here in keeping strictly to the Greek: the one—the other, Ellis, Original Letters, I. p. 352; Life of Davison, p. 235; Pref. to A. V. p. 118 a; Walton's Angler, p. 141; Dryden, I. p. 80; one—the other, Life of Davison, pp. 151, 341; Pref. to A. V. 117 a; Dryden, I. p. 128; and so also in recent English, but it is unnecessary to give instances. — v. 25. *Be not anxious for*, after Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson, and this nearly after Dr. Campbell, *Be not anxious about*; *Take no thought for*, A. V. by a new rendering (*thought* in the old sense, of *excessive care, anxiety*, Shaksp. Jul. Caes. II, 1; Bacon, Hen. VII, p. 230); *Be not careful for*, Tynd., Cran., Gen., Rh., and so Dean Alford; *Be not thoughtful for*, Sir John Cheke, and so in vv. 27, 28, 31 and 34. — v. 25. *nor yet* (μηδέ), after A. V., Tynd., Cran., and Gen. by a free and idiomatic rendering, which is commonly emphatic (comp. S. Luke 23, 15), and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; neither, Rh.; nor, Wycl., and so Sir John Cheke and Dr. Campbell and Mr. Darby; comp. it is not known howe the Spanyards do take the same, ne yet what they intende, etc., Ellis, Original Letters, I. p. 286; none—nor yet, Pref. to ed. 1611, p. 115 a; never—nor yet, *ib.* p. 115 b; not—neither yet, *ib.* p. 118 b *bis*; neither—nor yet, South's Sermons, III. p. 62. But the Revisers in 10, 10 have changed *nor yet* (μηδέ) into *nor*. *the food—the raiment*, retaining the Greek article after Rh.; and so Dean Alford and Dr. Davidson; meat—raiment, A. V. after Wycl., Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; Dr. Noyes also and Mr. Darby omit the article. — v. 26. *birds*, after Sir John Cheke, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; fowls, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest, and so Dr. Campbell. *of the heaven*, by a literal and un-English phrase after Mr. Darby, which also occurs in A. V. Ps. 79, 2; 104, 12, but not in N. T.; of the air, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest, and so Sir John Cheke,

Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; of heaven, Dr. Campbell; see 5, 34. *that* (ὅτι), after Rh., and so Meyer, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; for, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *and*, close to the Greek (καί), after Wycl. and Rh., and so Sir John Cheke, Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; yet, A. V. after 2d Gen. to mark the opposition; and yet, Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen.; see on 1, 25. *Are not ye of much more value*, by a new rendering nearly after Dr. Campbell, Are not ye much more valuable, and Dr. Noyes, Are not ye of much greater value; Are ye not much better, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.—v. 27. *And which*, after Rh.; But who, Wycl.; the rest neglect the Greek particle (δέ).—v. 29. *yet* (δέ), after 2d Gen.; but, Rh.; And yet, A. V. by a free rendering after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen.—v. 30. *But* (δέ), after Dean Alford; And, Wycl. and Rh.; so Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson; Wherefore, A. V. by a very free rendering after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *doth so clothe*, after Rh.; so clothe, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.—v. 32. *For after all these things do the Gentiles seek*, after Wycl. and all but A. V. which includes this in parenthesis.—v. 33. *his kingdom*, by an omission from the text after Tischendorf according to *Cod. Sinaiticus* and *Cod. Vaticanus*; the kingdom of God, A. V. after Wycl., Cran., 2d Gen. and Rh.; the kingdom of heaven, Tynd. and 1st Gen.

CH. VII. v. 2. *unto you*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; *to you again*, A. V. after Tynd., Gen., and Rh.; agen to you, Wycl.—v. 4. *cast out*, literally after Gen. and Rh.; pull out, A. V. more suitably; and so Tynd. and Cran., plucke oute; and Wycl., do out. *cast out the mote out*, with the preposition repeated as in the Greek (ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ—), after A. V., Tynd. and all except Wycl., do out—fro; so in S. Luke 6, 42 after A. V. and Tynd. For this repetition, very rare in English, compare A. V. Jer. 8, 1, they shall bring out the bones—out of their graves; Sidney's *Arcadia*, p. 60, a maid which sate pulling out a thorn out of a Lambs foot; and with slight variation: he entered in once into the holy place (εἰσῆλθεν—εἰς), Heb. 9, 12; Rev. 22, 14; Peter went up upon the housetop, Acts 10, 9; on whosoever it shall fall upon, 21, 44, Tynd.; on whomsoever it shal fal upon, 1st Gen. It is very common in Greek and Latin; as ἐκβάλλειν—ἐκ, Thuc. 8, 108; Plat. Gorg. 468 D; ἐν—ἐνείναι, Thuc. 2, 43; Plat. Pol. 402 C; εἰς—εἰσπίπτειν, Plat. Lys. 222 D; ex—expellere, Cic. Or. pro Mil. 37, 101; in—inesse, *id.* de Off. 1, 5, 30; cum—conferre, *id.* Acad. 2, 73. *lo*, after Wycl.; behold, A. V. after Tynd. and all the rest.

*the beam*, retaining the Greek article, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; a beam, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest. — v. 5. *cast out*, after A. V., which seems to introduce this inferior rendering in this verse as a mere variation from v. 4. — v. 5. *cast out first*, change of order to keep to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; and so Dean Alford and Mr. Darby; first cast out, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest, and so Dr. Noyes and Dr. Davidson. — v. 6. *cast*, omitting the subject as in the Greek, after Dr. Davidson and Mr. Darby; *cast ye*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest; so Dr. Noyes and Dean Alford; but the insertion here is harsh; see on 4, 17. *the swine*, retaining the Greek article after Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson; swine, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest, and so Dr. Noyes and Dean Alford. *lest haply*, to keep closer to the Greek (μήποτε); so nearly Wycl., lest peradventure, and Rh., lest perhaps; lest, A. V. and all the rest, and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson. *turn*, close to the Greek after Dr. Davidson; turn again, A. V. after Tynd. and Gen., and so Dean Alford; turn round, Mr. Darby; turne against you, Cran.; turn upon you, Dr. Noyes; torn back on yow, Sir John Cheke. — v. 9. *who, if his son shall ask him for a loaf, will give him a stone*, by a new rendering, but nearly after Gen., which if his sonne aske him bread, woulde give him a stone; so nearly Dr. Noyes, who, if his son ask for bread, will give him a stone; and Dr. Davidson, who if his son shall ask bread, will give him a stone; whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone, A. V. by a new rendering, but nearly after Cran., which (yf his sonne aske bred) wil offer him a stone. — v. 10. *or if he shall ask for a fish, will give him a serpent*, by a new rendering, but nearly after Dr. Noyes, or, if he ask a fish, will give him a serpent; Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent, A. V. by a new rendering, but nearly after Cran., Or yf he aske fysshe, wile he profer him a serpent. — v. 11. *your Father which*, A. V. after Tynd. and all the rest except Wycl., youre Fadir that; see on 2, 6. — v. 12. *All things therefore*, change of order after Rh., which imitates the Greek; Therefore all things, A. V. after Wycl., which has the advantage of bringing the antecedent directly before the relative. *unto you—unto them*, by a new rendering; to you—to them, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest, and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson. *even so do ye also* (οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε), by a new and free rendering (οὕτω, *even so*), nearly after Cran., do ye evenso to them also; do ye even so to them, A. V. by a new rendering, and so Dean Alford. — v. 13. *by* (διὰ), closer to the Greek, after Wycl. and Rh.; at, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest.



*narrow*, after Rh., and so Sir John Cheke; *strait*, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; so v. 14. *wide is the gate and broad is the way*, supplying *is* twice but not italicizing it; see on 1, 17; *wide is the gate and broad is the way*, A. V., which would be improved by omitting *is* in the second place, as the Revisers themselves have done in v. 14; Mr. Darby and Dr. Davidson keep close to the Greek, *wide the gate and broad the way*. *many be they that enter in thereby*, by a new rendering, but nearly after Rh., *many there be that enter by it*. — v. 14. *For* (ὅτι), after Cran.; *Because*, A. V. after Gen. *straitened*, by a new rendering, but nearly after Rh., *straite. the way, that*, after Wycl., Gen., and Rh.; *the way*, which, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *few be they that find it*, by a new rendering to conform it to v. 13; *few there be that find it*, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen. *prophets which*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest except Wycl., *profetis that*; see on 2, 6. — v. 15. *but inwardly are ravening wolves*, omitting *they* of A. V. to give unity to the sentence; see on 5, 11. — v. 16. *By their fruits ye shall know them*, change of order after the Greek, and so Wycl. and Rh.; *Ye shall know them by their fruits*, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *men*, supplied and italicized, but not italicized by A. V.; see on 1, 17. — v. 17. *Even so* (οὕτω), free rendering after A. V.; see v. 12. *the corrupt tree*, retaining the Greek article, after Rh., and so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; *a corrupt tree*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest, and so Dr. Noyes. — v. 18. *can*, supplied but not italicized; *can*, A. V.; see on 1, 17. — v. 20. *Therefore* (ἀπαρ), after Wycl., 2d Gen., and Rh.; *Wherefore*, A. V. after Tynd. and Cran.; *Then, by their fruites*, 1st Gen., which seems best, but with the order, *By their fruits then*; comp. v. 16. — v. 21. *my Father which*, A. V. after Tynd. and all the rest except Wycl., *my Fadir that*; see on 2, 6. — v. 22. *did we not prophesy* (a Greek aorist, not perfect), after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; *have we not prophesied*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest, and so Mr. Darby, see on 2, 2. *by—by—by*, after Gen.; *in—in—in*, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest, and so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson. *mighty works*, (δυνάμεις), after Dr. Davidson; *mighti thinges*, Sir John Cheke; *great works*, Gen.; *works of power*, Mr. Darby; *wonderful works*, A. V. by a new rendering, and so Dean Alford. — v. 24. *Every one therefore which*, nearly after Rh., *Every one therefore that*, and so Dr. Davidson; *Therefore whosoever*, A. V. by a new rendering, and so Dean Alford. *words*, after Wycl., Cran., 2d Gen., and Rh.; *sayings*, A. V. after Tynd. and 1st Gen.; so v. 26. *shall be likened*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischen-

dorf, and Tregelles; and so Rh. and nearly Wycl.; I will liken him, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. *the rock*, retaining the Greek article, after Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; a rock, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest; so Dr. Noyes. — v. 25. *the rock*, as in v. 24, after Tynd. and Cran.; so Dean Alford, Mr. Darby, and Dr. Davidson; a rock, A. V. after Wycl. (a stone), Gen. and Rh.; so Dr. Noyes. — v. 27. *smote upon*, (προσκόπτειν, but in v. 25 προσπίπτειν), by a new rendering; beat upon, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and Gen.; so Dr. Noyes. *thereof*, after Wycl., 2d Gen., and Rh.; of it, A. V. after Tynd., Cran., and 1st Gen. — v. 28. *And it came to pass*,—*the multitudes*—, omitting *that*, after the Greek; and so A. V. after Wycl., Gen., and Rh.; *that*, supplied by Tynd. and Cran., which is better English. The phrase *And it came to pass* (καὶ ἐγένετο) has two Hebrew constructions, one absolute as here and in 11, 1; 13, 53; 19, 1; 26, 1 etc.; and the other followed by *that* (καὶ; see on 1, 25), as S. Luke 5, 1; 5, 17; 8, 1; 8, 22 etc.; it has a third, followed by *that behold* (καὶ ἴδου), as 9, 10, S. Luke 5, 12; 24, 4; and a fourth, a rare Greek construction, with the Acc. and Inf., as S. Mark 2, 15; 2, 23; S. Luke 3, 21; 6, 1 etc. The Revisers seem to have intended to treat these different constructions with exactness, rendering the first without *that*, the second and the fourth by *that*, and the third by *behold*. But in the first construction they have inserted *that* without italics in S. Mark 1, 9; S. Luke 1, 59; 7, 11; 11, 1; and in the second construction have omitted *that* in S. Luke 9, 28, where καὶ is read by Tischendorf and Tregelles, whom the Revisers here follow according to Dr. Scrivener and Prof. Palmer. *ended* (Greek aorist, not pluperfect), by a new rendering; finished, Dr. Davidson; had ended, A. V. after Wycl. and all the rest, and so de Wette and Germ. Rev., Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; had finished, Mr. Darby. The pluperfect seems generally to have been preferred here; see on 1, 24. *the multitudes*, close to the Greek, as in 4, 25, after Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; the multitude, Rh.; the people, A. V. after Wycl. and the rest. *teaching*, after Wycl. and Sir John Cheke; excellently, as the two English words (*teaching*—*taught*) belong together etymologically as the two Greek words (διδάχῃ—διδάσκων) do; so Dr. Noyes, Dean Alford, and Dr. Davidson; doctrine, A. V. after Tynd. and the rest. — v. 29. *their scribes*, by a change of text after Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; so Wycl. (the scribis of hem) and Rh.; the scribes, A. V. after Tynd. and Gen.

CHARLES SHORT.

## II.—NONIUS MARCELLUS.

### II.

#### Book I.

[All notes with the initials J. H. O., as well as all notes of readings from the Harleian manuscript, I owe to my friend Mr. J. H. Onions, of Christ Church.—H. N.]

P. 1. With this note on *senium*, the illustrations of which commence with a quotation from Caecilius, comp. Festus 339, *senium* a senili acerbitate ac vitiis dictum posuit Caecilius in Hymnide, 'sine suam senectutem ducat usque ad senium Sorbilo.'

P. 3. *Velitatio* stands at the head of a series of words illustrated from Plautus. *Advelitatio* in Paulus 28 occurs also in a Plautine series, and *velitatio* is illustrated by Paulus 369 by the same passage from the *Menaechmi* as that cited by Nonius.

*Phrygionis*. With the note of Nonius compare Isidore 19 22 22 *acupicta* vestis . . . eadem et Phrygia: huius enim artis periti Phrygii omnes dicuntur, sive quia inventa est in Phrygia. Unde et artifices qui id faciunt Phrygiones dicuntur. Vergilius, 'Phrygiam chlamydem.' Serv. A. 3 484 *Phrygiam chlamydem* aut acu pictam, huius enim artis peritos Phrygiones dicimus *secundum Plautum*, in Phrygia enim inventa est haec ars, aut, etc. So Servius A. 9 614. I have italicized the words *secundum Plautum*, as the note of Nonius is illustrated by a quotation from Plautus among others, a fact which may point to a community of sources for the notes of Nonius, Servius, and Isidore.

*Hostimentum* est aequamentum, unde et hostes dicti sunt, qui ex aequa causa pugnam ineunt. Plautus . . . Compare Festus 102 *hostimentum* beneficii pensatio, Placidus 12 *hostiae* autem *aequae*, ab *hostimento*, i. e. *aequamento*; Servius A. 2 156 (Dan.) *hostia* vero victima, . . . unde *hostimentum* aequationem. One of the passages from Plautus quoted by Nonius is also cited by Servius A. 4 124 on the word *hostis*. With these passages should also be compared the fuller note of Festus 270, *redhostire*, *referre gratiam*; Novius in Lupo, Accius . . . nam et hos-

tire pro *aequare* posuerunt, Ennius in Cresphonte, 'audi, atque auditis *hostimentum* adiungito,' etc.

P. 4. The note on *capulum* should be compared with Paulus 61 and Servius A. 6 222, who quotes the same passage from the *Miles* of Plautus.

P. 5. *Temulenta* est ebriosa, dicta a temeto, quod est vinum, quod attemptet. Plautus *Aulularia* . . . Festus 364 on *temetum* quotes the same line from the *Aulularia*. Compare further Gellius 10 23 1, Donatus Andr. 1 4 2, Placidus 83, Isid. 10 271.

P. 6. *Exercitum* dicitur fatigatum. Plautus, Sallust, etc. Paulus 81 *exercitus* et militum copia dicitur, et homo multis negotiis exercitus.

*Pellices* a Graeco vocabulo . . . quasi *πάλλαξ*, etc. Comp. Gellius 4 3 3, who quotes a *lex Numae* in illustration. The note may come from Verrius Flaccus, for Paulus 222 has the same quotation.

*Calvitur* dictum est frustratur, etc. The word is quoted from the Twelve Tables by Festus 313.

P. 8. *Nautea*. The gloss in Nonius is illustrated by quotations from Plautus, and so is that of Paulus 165 on the same word. Compare also Placidus 68, *nautea*, aqua coriis foetida, in qua corium maceratur.

*Caperare* est rugis frontem contrahere et asperare, tractum a caprorum frontibus crispis. Plautus *Epidico* . . . Varro *Eumenidibus*, 'quin mihi caperatam tuam frontem, Strobile, omitis.' The last quotation may have suggested the form of the gloss in Paulus 48, *caperatum*, rugosum, a cornuum caprinorum similitudine dicitur. Comp. Placidus 29.

P. 9. *Examussim* dicitur examine ad regulam vel coagmentum: est enim amussis regula fabrorum, quam architecti, cum opus probant, rubrica inlinunt. Plautus—Varro . . . The substance of this gloss is the same as that of the note of Sisenna quoted by Charisius p. 198; but it may have come to Nonius through Verrius Flaccus. Paulus 80 *examussim*, regulariter; *amussis* enim regula fabrorum est, vel ut alii volunt ferramentum quo in poliendo utuntur. The same note recurs in Placidus 12, and 37.

*Mutus* onomatopoea est incertae vocis, quasi mugitus. Isidore 10 169 *mutus* eo quod ei vox non est nec sermo nisi mugitus.

*Focula* dicta sunt nutrimenta: unde et *foculare* dicitur, ut fovere Plautus *Persa* . . . Paulus 85 *focus fomenta focillationes*

*foculi* a fovendo, id est calefaciendo, dicta sunt. Comp. Servius (Dan.) A. 11 211, Servius A. 12 118 = Isidore 20 10 1.

P. 10. *Bardum* est vi propria ingenio tardum. Nam Graeci *βαρδείς* tardos dicebant. Homerus . . . Plautus . . . Paulus 34 *bardus*, stultus, a tarditate ingenii appellatur. Caecilius 'audacem nimisque bardum barbarum.' Trahitur autem a Graeco, quod illi *βαρδής* dicunt. Compare Placidus 14.

*Inlex* et *exlex* est qui sine lege vivit. Plautus . . . Lucilius . . . Varro . . . Caecilius . . . Sisenna. Paulus 113 *inlex* producta sequenti syllaba significat qui legi non paret. *Inlex* correpta sequenti syllaba significat *inductor*, ab inliciendo. Plautus 'Esca est meretrix, pectus inlex.' Nonius 447 makes this distinction between *inlex* and *inlix*, illustrating from Plautus.

*Lurcones* dicti sunt a lurchando; *lurcare* est cum aviditate cibum sumere. Lucilius . . . Pomponius . . . Plautus . . . Varro. Paulus 120 *lura* os cullei vel etiam utris, unde *lurcones* capacis gulae homines et bonorum suorum consumptores.

P. 11. *Concenturiare* est colligere, dictum a centuriis quae ad suffragia conveniebant. Plautus . . . Terentius . . . Placidus 27 *concenturiat*, instruit, ordinat; dictum a centurionibus qui milites ordinant.

P. 12. *Exsules* dicuntur extra solum. Vergilius . . . So Terentius Scaurus p. 28 (Keil), Servius A. 3 11, Placidus 39, Isidore 5 27 28.

P. 13. *Haustra* proprie dicuntur rotarum cadi, ab hauriendo; sicuti Graece *ἄνδρα*. Lucretius lib. V 'ut fluvios versare rotas atque haustra videmus.' Isidore 20 15 1 s. v. *rota* seems to have followed the same authority as Nonius; after quoting the same line of Lucretius, he says *haustra* autem, i. e. *rota*, ab haurienda aqua dicta.

*Veterina* animalia dicuntur omnia quae vehere quid possunt. Lucretius . . . Paulus 369 *veterinam* bestiam Cato appellavit a vehendo, etc.

*Crepera* res proprie dicitur dubia, unde et *crepusculum* dicitur lux dubia, et senes decrepiti dicti, in dubio vitae constituti. *Creperum* bellum, anceps et dubium. Lucretius . . . Accius . . . Lucilius . . . Pacuvius . . . Plautus . . . Varro . . . The same explanation, and the same reference to *crepusculum* and *decrepitus*, may be found in Paulus 52, 71. Compare Varro L. L. 6 5, 7 77, Servius A. 2 268, Placidus 24, Isidore 5 31 7, 10 74.



P. 14. *Vitulantes* veteres gaudentes dixerunt, dictum a bonae vitae commodo; sicuti **nunc** qui est in summa laetitia, *vivere* eum dicimus. Naevius Lycurgo 'ut in venatu vitulantes ex suis,' etc. The derivation given by Paulus 369 (it does not follow that he has preserved the real opinion of Verrius) is from *vitulus*, though in the line which he quotes from Ennius 'is habet coronam vitulans victoria' the first syllable is long. Varro L. L. 7 107, who also quotes Naevius, derives from *vitula*.

P. 15. *Grumus* dicitur agger, a congerie dictus. Accius Oenomao. Paulus 96 *grumus* terrae collectio, minor tumulo.

*Torrus*. Quoted by Servius A. 12 298 as used by Ennius and Pacuvius.

P. 16. *Expectorare* est extra pectus eicere. Accius . . . Ennius. Paulus 80 *expectoral*, ex pectore eicit. Quintilian 8 3 31 veteres ne *expectorat* quidem timuerunt, et sane eiusdem notae est *exanimat*. Quintilian and perhaps Verrius may have been referring to the line of Ennius quoted by Nonius, 'tum pavor sapientiam omnem mi exanimato expectorat.'

*Lactare* est inducere vel mulcere, velle decipere. Accius . . . Pacuvius . . . Caecilius . . . Varro . . . Cicero. Paulus 117 *lakit*, in fraudem inducit. Inde est *allicere* et *laccessere*, inde *lactat illectat delectat oblectat*. Donatus Andr. 4 1 24 *lactasses* pro duxisses, oblectasses, induxisses . . . unde et *oblectare* dicitur. Placidus 59 *lactatus*, inductus, captus.

P. 17. The notes on *strena* and *adulatio* may be compared, but only generally, with those in Festus 313, Paulus 21.

*Manducones*, qui et *manduci* sunt et *mandones*, edaces. Pomponius . . . Lucilius . . . Varro. Paulus 128 *manduci* effigies in pompa antiquorum inter ceteras ridiculas formidolosasque ire solebat magnis malis ac late dehiscens, et ingentem dentibus sonitum faciens, de quo Plautus ait 'quid si ad ludos me pro manduco locem,' etc. So Placidus 68.

*Exdorsuare*, dorso nudare. Plautus Aulularia, 'Tu Machaerio, Congrum, murenā exdorsua, quantum potes.' Paulus 79 *exdorsua*, dorsum confringe: alii nudare.

P. 18. *Rumen* dicitur locus in ventre quo cibus sumitur, et unde redditur; unde et ruminare dicitur. Pomponius Prostibulo . . . Paulus 270 *rumen* est pars colli qua esca devoratur, unde *rumare* dicitur quod nunc *ruminare*. Comp. Donatus Ad. 5 8 27, Servius A. 8 90, Isidore 11 1 59.

*Rutrum* dicitur a rodendo. (Is not Mercier right in conjecturing *ruendo*?) Pomponius . . . Lucilius . . . Varro. Paulus 263 *rutrum* dictum quod eo harena eruitur.

*Nebulones* et *tenebriones* dicti sunt qui mendaciis et astutiis suis nebulam quandam ac tenebras obiciant; aut quibus ad fugam et furta haec erant accommodata et utilia. Pomponius . . . Lucilius . . . Afranius . . . Varro. Festus 165 *nebulo* dictus est, ut ait Aelius Stilo, qui non pluris est quam nebula, aut quia non facile perspicui possit qualis sit. Donatus Eun. 2 2 38 *nebulonem*, vel furem, quia nebulas obiciat, vel mollem ut nebulam, vel inanem et vanum, ut nebula est. Comp. Acron on Horace Epist. 1 2 28.

P. 19. *Truam* veteres a terendo, quam nos diminutive *trullam* dicimus, appellari voluerunt. Pomponius Pannuceatis . . . Titinius Setina . . . "cocus magnum ahenum, quando fervit, paula confutat trua." It is difficult to resist the impression that the note of Paulus 9 (*truam* quoque vocant *quo permovent coquentes exta*) was based on the line of Titinius.

P. 20. *Corporare* est interficere, et quasi corpus solum sine anima relinquere. Ennius . . . Accius . . . Placidus 29 *corporato*, vulnerato.

P. 21. *Cernuus* dicitur proprie inclinatus, quasi quod terram cernat. Lucilius . . . Vergilius . . . Varro de Vita P. R. lib. I. . . . Servius A. 10 894 *cernuus* dicitur equus qui cadit in faciem, quasi in eam partem qua cernimus. Unde et pueri quos in ludis videmus ea parte qua cernunt stantes cernui vocantur, ut etiam Varro in Ludis Theatralibus docet.

*Stricturae* dicuntur proprie scintillae quae de ferro ferventi eunt, aut quod stricte emittuntur, id est celeriter, aut quod oculos sui fulgore praestringant. Vergilius . . . Lucilius . . . The latter derivation is given by Pliny 34 143, who is copied by Isidore 16 21 3. [In 19 10 1 Isidore gives a different etymology. J. H. O.]

*Quiritare* est clamare, tractum ab iis qui Quirites invocant. Lucilius . . . Nigidius . . . Donatus Ad. 2 1 1 veteres *quiritari* dicebant Quirites conclamare.

*Caries* est vetustas vel putrilago; unde *cariceum* veteres dixerunt. Lucilius . . . Turpilius . . . Afranius. Isidore 17 6 28 *caries* putredo lignorum, etc.

P. 22. *Capronae* dicuntur comae quae ante frontem sunt, quasi a capite pronae. Lucilius. Paulus 48 *capronae* equorum iubae in frontem devexae, dictae quasi a capite pronae. Placidus 26 *capronas*, iubas equorum.

*Gliscit* est congelascit et colligitur, vel crescit, vel ignescit. Turpilius . . . Accius . . . Pacuvius . . . Sallustius . . . Vergilius . . . Cicero. Paulus 98 *gliscere* crescere est: comp. Festus 278 s. v. *reglescit*. Servius A. 12 9 *gliscit* crescit . . . [Veteres *gliscit* incremento ignis ponebant, etc.]

P. 23. *Sagae* mulieres dicuntur feminarum ad libidinem virorum indagatrices, unde et *sagaces* canes dicuntur ferarum vel animalium quaesitores. Lucilius . . . Turpilius. Festus 321 *sagaces* appellantur multi ac sollertis acuminis. Afranius in Brundisina . . . Lucretius lib. II . . . *Sagacem* etiam canem dixit, 'invictus canis atque sagax et viribus fretus.' *Saga* quoque dicitur mulier perita sacrorum, et *sagus* sapiens, producta prima syllaba, forsitan propter ambiguitatem evitandam.

*Lapit* significat obdure facit, et lapidem facit. Pacuvius Periboea 'lapit cor cura, aerumna corpus conficit.' Paulus 118 *lapit*, dolore adficit.

*Munes* apud veteres dicebantur . . . consentientes ad ea quae amici velint. Pacuvius Duloreste . . . Sallustius . . . Lucilius. Paulus 143 *munem* significare certum est officiosum, unde e contrario *immunis* dicitur qui nullo fungitur officio: comp. Serv. A. 12 559, Nonius 137 s. v. *munia*, Plautus Mercatore 'dico eius pro meritis gratum me ac munem fore.'

*Petulantia* dicta est a petendo. M. Tullius de Republica lib. IV. Festus 206 *petulantes* et *petulci* etiam appellantur qui protervo impetu et crebro petunt laedendi alterius gratia. Vergilius . . . Lucretius . . . Afranius. Comp. Servius G. 4 10 (=Isidore 10 231), and Isidore 10 213.

*Procacitas* a procando vel poscendo: unde et *proci* dicti sunt matrimoniorum petitores . . . Cicero . . . Terence . . . Livius Andronicus. Paulus 224 *procare* poscere, unde *procaces* meretrices ab adsidue procando, et *proci* uxorem poscentes in matrimonium. So again 225, 249. Comp. Donatus Hec. 1 2 84, Servius A. 1 536, Placidus 76, Isidore 10 214.

*Kalendarum* vocabulum proprium Varro complexus est. De Vita P. R. lib. I, 'Itaque kalendis kalabantur, id est vocabantur, et ab eo kalendae appellatae, quod est tractum a Graecis, qui *καλεῖν* vocare dixerunt.' Paulus 225 *procalare* provocare, ex Graeco *καλεῖν*, i. e. voco: unde *kalendae calumnia* et *caculae* et *calatores*. Compare Servius A. 8 654 on *curia Calabra*.

P. 24. *Ignominia* est nominis nota. M. Tullius de Republica lib. IV . . . Lucilius. Isidore 5 26 25 *ignominia* eo quod desinat

habere honestatis nomen is qui in aliquo crimine deprehenditur. Dicta autem est ignominia quasi sine nomine, sicut ignarus sine scientia, sicut ignobilis sine nobilitate.

*Fidei* proprietatem exemplo manifestavit M. Tullius de Republica lib. IV, '*fides* enim nomen ipsum mihi videtur habere cum fit quod dicitur.' Isidore 5 24 17 nam *fides* dicta eo quod fiat. 10 98 *fidelis* pro eo quod ab eo fit id quod dicit.

P. 25. *Seditionis* proprietatem a M. Tullio manifestata est in libro de Republica VI, 'eaeque dissensio civium, quod seorsum eunt alii ad alios, seditio dicitur.' The same note, illustrated by the same quotation, is given by Servius (Dan) A. 1 149, Isidore 5 26 11.

*Catax* dicitur quem nunc coxonem vocant. Lucilius . . . Paulus 45 *catax*, claudus.

*Silones* superciliis prominentibus dicti, significatione manifesta. Varro γνόθι σεαυτὸν . . . I have argued in the Transactions of the Oxford Philological Society (1879-80) that *silones* ought to be corrected into *cilones*. C and s are constantly confused in manuscripts, and notably so in the Harleian MS. of Nonius. I do not see how *silo* can mean a man with prominent eyebrows. If *cilones* be right, compare Paulus 43, *chilo* dicitur cognomento a magnitudine laborum; *cilo* sine aspiratione, cui frons et eminentior, ac dextra sinistraque veluti recisa videtur. See further Caper Orth. p. 97 Keil, and Placidus 25.

*Compernes* dicuntur longis pedibus. Lucilius . . . Better Paulus 41, *compernes* nominantur homines genibus plus iusto coniunctis.

P. 26. *Lingulacae* dicuntur verbosi. Varro Papia papae . . . Paulus 117 *lingulaca* genus piscis, vel mulier argutatrix.

*Rabulae* litigiosi, a rabie dicti. Varro Papia papae . . . Paulus 272 *rabula* dicitur in multis intentus negotiis peritusque ad radendum (rapiendum?) quid auferendumque, vel quia est in negotiis agendis acrior, quasi rabiosus.

P. 27. *Strabones* sunt *strabi* quos nunc dicimus. Varro Flaxtabulis, περὶ ἐπαρχῶν, 'multi enim, qui limina intrarunt integris oculis, strabones sunt facti' . . . Lucilius . . . Compare Pliny 11 150, Acron and Porphyrio on Horace S. 1 3 44.

*Exterminatum* est praeter terminos missum. Lucilius . . . Cicero. Isidore 10 87 *exterminatus* ab eo quod sit extra terminos suos eiectus.

*Exodium* est finis, a Graeco tractum, quasi ἐξω τῆς ὁδοῦ, etc. Illustrated by three quotations from Varro's *Saturae*, in two of which the phrase *ad exodium* occurs. Paulus 80 *exodium*, exitum;

Placidus 9 *ad exodium*, ad finem vel terminum. [In the first example from Varro the Harleian MS. has κώνειον, *exodium*; should we not read κώνειον *ad exodium*? J. H. O.]

*Putus* est dictus a putando (so the Harleian). Plautus Pseudolo 'purus putus est ipsus.' Varro Hecatombe . . . Prometheo . . . Nam et rationes ea causa *putari* dictae sunt quotiens ex his fraudis aut falsi aut mendacii aut iniqui aliquid separatur. Et ipsum namque dubitantes cum dicimus *puto*, significamus nos in rebus incertis et obscuris falsis opinionibus fieri ambiguos. This is a test passage as bearing on the relation between Gellius and Nonius. Gellius 7 5 discusses the words *putus* and *putare*, mainly in reference to the phrase *argenti puri puti*, occurring in an ancient treaty between Rome and Carthage. He quotes the phrase also from the *Alexander* of Ennius, and the *δῖς παῖδες, οἱ γέροντες* of Varro. The gist of the notes in Gellius and Nonius is much the same, but in the instances he quotes Nonius is entirely independent of Gellius. The common authority may well have been Verrius Flaccus, for Paulus and Festus (216, 217) have the following note: *putus* antiqui dicebant pro *puro*, unde *putatae* vites et arbores, quod decisis impedimentis remanerent purae. Aurum quoque putatum dici solet, id est expurgatum, et ratio putata, id est pura facta. Instances are given from Ennius and Plautus. It will be observed that the original note of Verrius must have covered the ground occupied both by Gellius and Nonius, in respect both of its statements and its illustrations. The same note, or parts of it, may be found in Paulus 108 s. v. *imputatum*. Donatus And. 2 6 11, Ad. 5 3 10, Servius (Dan.) A. 8 522, and Isidore 17 5 32.

P. 28. *Compedes* non a pedibus dictae, sed ab impedimento. Varro Prometheo . . . Flaxtabulis . . . Parmenone . . . Sesiulix. The theory repudiated by Nonius is represented by Placidus 16 and Isidore 5 27 7.

*Edulia* . . . Afranius Privigno. Placidus 40 *edulia*, cibus vel esca, ab edendo dicta.

P. 29. *Merenda* dicitur cibus qui post meridiem datur. Afranius Fratriis . . . Paulus 123 *merendam* antiqui dicebant pro prandio, quod scilicet medio die caperetur. Fuller notes on this word are given by Isidore 20 2 12, 20 3 3.

*Calces* a calcando, quod est nitendo, dictae sunt, non a calcitrando; nam de omnibus pedibus et de hominum et universorum animantium dici potest. Nam sunt calces extrema pars pedum terrae proxima. Vergilius lib. V . . . X . . . Servius A. 5 324 *calcem* dicimus



unde terram calcamus: ergo non proprie dixit *calcem calce terit*, etc. Isidore 11 1 114 *calcis* prima pars plantae; a callo illi (illo?) nomen impositum quo terram calcamus, etc.

P. 29-30. The notes on *mediocritas* and *modestia* may be compared roughly with those in Isidore 10 172, 168.

P. 30. *Antes* sunt quadraturae, unde et *antae* dictae sunt quadrae columnae. Vergilius Georgicorum lib. II, 'iam canit effectos extremus vinitor antes.' Paulus 16 *antes* sunt extremi ordines vinearum. Unde etiam nomen trahunt *antae*, quae sunt latera ostiorum. Compare Servius and Philargyrius on G. 2 417.

*Camerum*, obtortum; unde et *camerae*, tecta in curvitatem formata. Vergilius Georgicorum lib. III. Paulus 43 *camera* et *camuri boves* a curvatione ex Graeco κ'μπη dicuntur. Comp. Philargyrius G. 3 55, Isidore 15 8 5, Macrobius Sat. 6 4 23.

*Immunis* dicitur sine officio, sine munere. Vergilius Georgicorum lib. IV . . . Cicero Philippica I. Paulus 109, *immunis*, vacans munere, aliquotiens pro improbo ponitur, ut apud Plautum, 'immune est facinus.' Compare further Servius A. 12 559, Scholia Bobiensia Pro Sest. 57 (p. 306 Orelli), Philargyrius G. 4 244, Isidore 10 140, notes which are all apparently ultimately to be referred to Verrius Flaccus.

*Dirum* est triste, infensum, et quasi deorum ira missum. Vergil . . . Cicero De Senectute. Paulus 69, *dirus*, dei ira natus. So Servius A. 6 373, Isidore 10 75.

*Exordium* est initium; unde et vestis *ordiri* dicitur cum instituitur detexenda. Vergil . . . Cicero . . . Lucilius. Festus 185 *ordiri* est rei principium facere, unde et togae vocantur exordia (?). Isidore 19 29 7 *ordiri* est texere.

P. 31. *Sudum* dictum est quasi semiudum, ut est aër post pluvias serenus et liquidus. Vergil . . . Plautus . . . Lucilius. Servius A. 8 529 *sudum* est quasi subudum, serenum post pluvias . . . [Alii *sudum* semiudum volunt dici, cum per nubes ad nos perveniat solis ictus non integer.] Philargyrius G. 477 *sudum* est serenum, subumidum; proprie autem *sudum* pars serena inter nubes, quasi semiudum. Festus 294 *sudum* Verrius ait significare sub[udum]. Sed auctorum omnia exempla poscunt ut su]dus significet . . . *sine udo*, ut se[curus sine cura].

*Inrilare* dictum est proprie provocare, tractum a canibus, qui cum provocantur, irriunt. Lucilius . . . Terence . . . Vergil . . . Sallust . . . Plautus . . . Varro. Festus 101 *hirrire*, garrire, quod genus vocis est canis rabiosae. Donatus And. 3 4 18

*inritatus*, commotus, ira provocatus, ut in Phormione. Ducitur autem verbum a canibus, qui restrictis dentibus hanc litteram *R* inritantur. Ad. 2 4 18 *inritari* proprie canes dicuntur. Lucilius de littera *R*, '*inritata* canes quod homo quam planius dicit.' As this line of Lucilius, and a line out of the Phormio, are quoted by Nonius, it is reasonable to suppose that the notes of Donatus and Nonius are derived from the same source.

P. 32. *Arcanum* dicitur secretum vel absconditum, quod quae in arca sunt, celata sirt et abscondita. Vergilius Aeneidos lib. IV . . . lib. I. Paulus 16 *arcani* sermonis significatio trahitur sive ab arce . . . sive ab arca, in qua quae clausa sint tuta manent, cuius ipsius origo ab arcendo pendet. Servius A. 1 262 *arcana* secreta. Unde et arca et arx dictae. Isidore 20 9 2 *arcanum*, id est secretum, unde ceteri arcentur.

*Tormina* genus morbi, dicti quod dolore torqueat. Cicero Tusculanarum lib. II. Isidore 4 6 14 *ileos* dolor intestinorum . . . Hi et *torminosi* dicuntur ab intestinorum tormento.

*Monumenti* proprietatem a monendo M. Tullius exprimendam putavit, ad Caesarem Epistola II . . . Vergilius lib. V. Paulus 139 *monere* . . . sic monimenta quae in sepulcris. Comp. Servius A. 3 486, Isid. 15 11 1.

*Rivales* dicti sunt quasi in unum amorem derivantes. Terentius in Eunucho. Donatus Eun. 5 8 42 *rivales* . . . facta translatione nominis a feris bestiis, quae sitientes cum ex eodem rivulo haustum petunt, in proelium contra se invicem concitantur. Sic Cicero pro Caelio, 'sin erit ex eodem fonte rivalis.' Placidus 79 *rivales*, qui de uno amore discedunt.

*Gestire* significat laetum esse; dictum a gesticulis facilioribus (felicioribus?). Terentius in Eunucho . . . Vergilius Georgicorum lib. I. Paulus 96 *gestit* qui subita felicitate exhilaratus nimio corporis motu praeter consuetudinem exultat. Servius G. 1 387 *gestire* est laetitiam suam corporis habitu significare. So more fully Donatus Eun. 3 5 7, who quotes the line from the first Georgic.

*Involare* est inruere, insilire; aut a volatu, aut a vola, id est media manu, dictum. Terentius Eunucho . . . Lucilius lib. XXX. Servius A. 3 233 *involare* dicimus intra volam tenere, etc. 6 198 *vola* dicitur media pars sive pedis sive manus. Paulus 370 s. v. *volae vestigium*, palma manus *vola* dicta.

P. 33. *Segne* . . . sine igni . . . Vergil . . . Cicero. So Velius Longus in the Verona Scholia A. 4 149, Isidore 10 247. Paulus 338 derives the word from *sine nitendo*.

P. 34. *Interpolare* est immittere et interponere . . . et est tractum ab arte fullonum, qui poliendo diligenter vetera quaeque quasi in novam speciem mutant. Cicero . . . Plautus. Isidore 19 22 23 *interpola* vestis illa dicitur, quae dum sit vetus ad novam speciem recuratur.

*Everriculum* genus est retis piscatorii, a verrendo dictum, vel quod trahatur, vel quod, si quid fuerit piscium nactum, everrat. Cicero. Paulus 78 *exverrae* sunt purgatio quaedam domus, ex qua mortuus ad sepulturam ferendus est, etc. Servius A. 1 59 *verrere* est trahere, a rete quod verriculum dicitur. Compare Isidore 19 5 3, Servius G. 1 142.

P. 35. *Angina* genus morbi, eo quod angat; et Graece *συνάγχη* appellatur. Lucilius lib. XXX. Paulus 8 . . . faucium dolor angina vocatur. Plautus, 'vellem me in anginam vorti, quo huic aniculae fauces praeoccuparem.' The same line of Plautus is quoted by Servius G. 3 497.

*Arquatus* morbus dictus qui regius dicitur, quod arcus sit color de virore, vel quod ita stringat corpora ut in arcum ducat. Lucilius . . . Varro. Isidore 4 8 13 *icteris* Graeci appellant a cuiusdam animalis nomine, quia sit coloris fellei. Hunc morbum Latini arcuatum, a similitudine caelestis arcus.

*Privum* est proprium unius cuiusque; unde et res privata. Lucilius lib. XXX . . . Idem. lib. I. Paulus 226 *privos privasque* antiqui dicebant pro singulis. Ob quam causam et *privata* dicuntur quae unius cuiusque sint: hinc et *privilegium* et *privatus*. Gellius 10 20 4 on the word *privilegium*: quia veteres *priva* dixerunt quae nos *singula* dicimus. Quo verbo Lucilius in primo saturarum libro usus est, etc. Nonius, it will be observed, adds a quotation from Lucilius which is not in Gellius. Acron Hor. S. 2 5 11 *privum* est quod unius cuiusque proprium est et alterius non est . . . unde et *privilegium*, ut hoc Plautinum indicat, 'exite et ferte fustes privos in manu.'

*Fratrum* proprietatem Nigidius acutissime dixit; 'frater est,' inquit, 'dictus quasi fere alter.' = Gellius 13 10 4. Paulus 90 *frater* a *φρίτην*, vel quod est fere alter.

P. 36. *Depilati* dictum rarefacti. Lucilius lib. XXIX, 'Gnatho, quid actum est? Depilati omnes sumus.' Paulus 204 *pilat* . . . pro detrahit pilos, a quo *depilati*.

P. 37. *Aqua intercus*, hydropum morbus; quasi aqua inter cutem. Lucilius . . . Cicero. Placidus 60 *intercus*, hydrops.

*Maltas* veteres, molles appellari voluerunt, a Graeco, quasi *μαλακούς*. (So the Harleian MS.) Lucilius lib. XXVII. Porphyrio Hor. S. 1 2 25 sub *Malthini* nomine quidam Maecenatem suspicantur significari; ab re tamen nomen finxit, *maltha* enim *μαλακός* dicitur. Paulus 135 *malta* dicitur Graece pix cum cera mixta.

*Portorium* dicitur merces quae portitoribus datur. Lucilius lib. XXVII. Festus 237 had a note on *portorium* which is now mutilated.

*Sedulo* significat sine dolo. Lucilius lib. XXVII. So Donatus Ad. 1 1 25, 3 3 59, Servius (Dan.) A. 2 374 = Isidore 10 247; comp. *ib.* 244.

P. 38. *Versipelles* dicti sunt quolibet genere se commutantes. Lucilius . . . Plautus. Isidore 10 278 *versipellis* eo quod in diversa vultum et mentem vertat. Inde et versutus et callidus.

*Capital* dictum est capitis periculum. Plautus . . . Lucilius. Paulus 48 *capital*, facinus quod capitis poena luitur.

*Clandestino* est abscondite. Lucilius lib. XXVI. Placidus 23 *clandestina* res, occulta.

P. 39. *Eliminare*, extra limen eicere. Pacuvius . . . Pomponius . . . Ennius . . . Accius. Quintilian 8 3 31 memini iuvenis admodum inter Pomponium et Senecam etiam praefationibus esse tractatum, an *gradus eliminat* in tragoedia dici oportuisset. Placidus 39 *eliminare*, extra limen proferre, vel publice secretum quid dicere.

*Vituperare* dictum est vitio dare, tamquam culpae vel dispendentiae. Terentius Andria. Donatus And. Prol. 8 *vituperare* est mala vitio dare et etiam bona.

*Pilare* dictum est ut *plumare*, pilis vestiri. Afranius . . . Novius. Paulus 204 *pilat*, pilos habere incipit.

P. 40. *Rabere* dictum est a rabie. Varro, Idem Attii quod Titii, 'quid est, *quid latras, quid rabis*, quid vis tibi'? Caecilius . . . Paulus 272-3 *ravidus* a rabie, qui morbus caninus est. Catullus, 'ravidus furor animi.'

*Tintinnire* dicitur sonare; unde et tintinnacula sunt appellata. Afranius Vopisco, 'tintinnire ianitoris impedimenta audio. Nigidius lib. XVII (XVIII the Harleian MS.) Festus 364 *tintinnare* est apud Naevium . . . et apud Afranium, 'ostiario impedimenta tintinnire audio.' Comp. Isidore 3 21 13.

*Verminari* positum torqueri, a vermibus, quod facile se torqueant. Pomponius. Festus 375, *vermina* dicuntur dolores corporis cum

quodam minuto motu quasi a vermibus scindatur. Hic dolor Graece *σρόφος* dicitur.

*Infabre*, foede, ut est *adfabre*, pulchre. Pacuvius Niptris. Paulus 28 *adfabrum*, *fabre factum*.

P. 41. *Reserare*, aperire, a *sera* dictum, etc. Festus 282 has a fragment on *resero* illustrated from Pacuvius.

*Tergiversari*, fallere et dicta mutare. Et est quasi *tergum* vertere, ut ait Plautus Amphitruone . . . M. Tullius de Officiis. Isidore 10 271 *tergiversator* quod animum quasi *tergum* vertat huc et illuc.

*Prudentiam* a providendo dictam dilucide ostendit M. Tullius in Hortensio, etc. Isidore 10, 201 *prudens*, quasi porro videns.

P. 42. *Occationem* ab occaecatis seminibus, qua id efficitur, dici M. Tullius voluit, de Senectute, etc. Comp. p. 61, *occationes* proprietas his indiciis aperitur. Varro de Re Rustica lib. I, 'et postea occare, id est comminuere, ne sit glaeba, quod ita occidunt, occare dictum.' Serenus 'Occatio occaecatio est.' Festus 181, *occare* et *occalorem* Verrius putat dictum ab occaedendo, quid caedit grandes globos terrae; cum Cicero venustissime dicat ab occaecando fruges satas. Both etymologies are given by Isidore 17 2 4.

*Verniliter* pro adulatorie, a vernis, quibus haec vivendi ars est. Caecilius Venatore. Placidus 84 *vernilis*, subdolanus et malus et servilis.

*Pecuniosorum* et *locupletium* proprietatem aperuit M. Tullius de Republica lib. II, a pecore *pecuniosos*, et a possessionibus locorum *locupletes* appellatos adserens; 'multaeque dictione ovium et boum, quod tunc erat res in pecore et locorum possessionibus, ex quo *pecuniosi* et *locupletes* vocabantur.' Paulus 119 *locupletes*, locorum multorum domini. Isidore 10 155, 209 refers to the same passage of Cicero as that quoted by Nonius. Compare further, Servius E. 1 33, Isidore 16 18 4.

P. 43. *Vernas* veteres appellabant qui vere sacro fuerant nati . . . Plautus . . . Lucilius. Festus 372 *vernae* qui in villis vere nati . . . et tunc rem divinam instituerit Marti Numa Pompilius pacis concordiaeque obtinendae gratia inter Sabinos Romanosque, etc.

*Concinnare* est facere, ut Plautus Amphitruone . . . Recte autem *concinere* et consentire intellegi potest, quasi *concanere*, etc. This note is evidently in a confused state, but some light may be thrown upon it by Paulus 38, *concinnare* est apte componere, *concinere* enim convenire est. It would appear from this that Verrius



must in some way have connected the two words. Compare further Placidus 27, *conciunnatus* factus. A similar note recurs in Nonius p. 90.

*Viritim*: Paulus 378 *viritim* dicitur dari quod datur per singulos viros.

P. 44. *Blatis* et *blateras*, *confinis*, aut *incondite* et *inaniter* loqueris [aut a Graeco βλάξ] aut a *balatu*. Plautus. The words in brackets I have introduced from Paulus 34: *blaterare* est stulte et praecipue loqui, quod a Graeco βλάξ originem ducit. Compare Placidus 15, Acron Hor. S. 2 7 35.

*Percontari*, diligenter inquirere. Plautus . . . Et est proprietates verbi ab eo tracta quod vada in fluminibus contis exquiruntur. Festus 214 *percunctatio* pro interrogatione dicta videtur ex nautico usu, quia conto pertemptant cognoscuntque navigantes aquae altitudinem. Ob quam causam ait Verrius etiam secundam syllabam per *o* solere scribi. So Donatus Hec. 1 2 2.

*Cerriti* et larvati male sani, et aut Cereris ira aut larvarum incurratione animo vexati. Plautus. Paulus 54, *cerritus*, furiosus: 1 19 *larvati* furiosi et mente moti, quasi larvis exterriti. Acron Hor. S. 2 3 277 *cerriti* proprie dicuntur qui a Cerere percussi sunt: so Servius A. 7 377.

P. 45. *Cassum* veteres inane posuerunt. Et arbitrandum est eius verbi proprietatem magis ab araneorum cassibus dictam, . . . non, ut quibusdam videtur, quasi *quassum*. The etymology repudiated by Nonius is adopted by Servius (Dan.) A. 2 85.

Propriam corvorum vocem *crocitum* veteres esse voluerunt. Plautus in *Aulularia*, 'simul radebat pedibus terram, et voce crocibat sua.' Paulus 53 *crocatio* corvorum vocis appellatio. (Müller suggests *crocitio*. The Harleian MS. of Nonius here reads originally *crocchitum* and *croccibat*; assuming the spelling with the double consonant correct, it would be easy for *croccire* to be corrupted into *crocicare*.)

*Sublevit* significat inludit et pro ridiculo habuit . . . Plautus. Placidus 79 *sublevit* subiunxit, a liniendo (surely *subunxit*, a liniendo.)

*Investes* dicuntur impuberes, quibus propter teneram aetatem nulla pars corporis pilat. Hoc et Aeneidos lib. VIII videtur sensisse Vergilius, 'aurea caesaries ollis atque aurea vestis.' So too Servius on the passage (A. 8 659). Paulus 368 *vesticeps* puer qui iam vestitus est pubertate; e contra *investis* est qui necdum pubertate vestitus est. Placidus 58 *investem*, impuberem, sine barba.

P. 46. *Febris* proprietatem a ferviditate morbi vel mali, ut a calendo calorem, Varro Andabatis aperiendam putat. So Isidore 4 6 2, Servius G. 3 458.

P. 47. *Exporrectum*, extentum; porrectum enim est tentum, id est, porro iactum. Varro Endymionibus, 'quare si in somnum recideris, ἀσπί ποτε (so Bücheler) eris iterum exporrectus.' Is this note corrupt, and made up out of two, one of which was on *experrectus* and the other on *exporrectus*? Paulus 80 has two notes: *experrectus* est qui per se vigilare coepit, *expergitus* ab alio excitatus: and a little below, *exporgere*, porro agere, exporrigare. On p. 79 he connects *experrectus* with *porrigo*.

*Torculum*, quod usu *torcular*, dictum quod intortum laticem vitis vel oleae exprimat. Varro. So Isidore 15 6 7 s. v. *torcular*.

*Cingulum* a cingendo . . . Varro Gerontodidascalo, 'novus maritus tacitulus taxim uxoris solvebat cingulum.' Paulus 63 *cingulo* nova nupta praecingebatur, quod vir in lecto solvebat, etc.

P. 48. *Silicernium* pessime intellegentes ita posuisse Terentium putant quod incurvitate silices cernat senex. *Silicernium* est proprie convivium funebre quod senibus exhibetur. Varro Meleagris. Donatus Ad. 4 2 48 gives as alternative derivations *silentes cernere* and *silicem cernere*. Paulus 295 *silicernium* erat genus farcinis, quo fletu (?) familia purgabatur. Dictum autem *silicernium* quod cuius nomine ea res instituebatur, is iam silentium cerneret. Caecilius Obolostate, 'credidi silicernium eius me esse esurum.'

*Elixum*, quicquid ex aqua mollitur vel decoquitur, nam *lixam* aquam veteres dixerunt, etc. Paulus 76 *elixum* a liquore dicta. Isidore 20 2 22 *elixum* eo quod in aqua sola decoquitur. *Lixa* enim aqua dicitur, ab eo quod sit soluta, etc.

*Parochus* a Graeco tractum est nomen, quod vehicula praebeat: ὀχήματα enim Graece, Latine vehicula appellantur. Varro. Acron Hor. S. 1 5 45 *parochi* genus officii qui solent peregrinis salem et ligna praebere, et significat publicum cursum. Vel parochi sunt qui solent legatis causa rei publicae iter facientibus necessaria ministrare, publici muliones.

P. 49. *Trossuli*, equites Romani, dicti sunt torosuli (so I think we should read after the first hand of the Harleian MS.) Varro. Paulus 367 *trossuli* equites dicti quod oppidum Tusculorum Trossulum sine opera peditum ceperint.

*Cetarii* genus est piscatorum quod maiores pisces capit, dictum ab eo quod cete in mari maiora sunt piscium genera. Vergil . . . Varro. So Donatus Eun. 2 2 25, Placidus 22.

P. 50. *Lingulacae*, locutuleiae, a procacitate linguae et loquendi proprietatem trahunt. Plautus. Paulus 117 (quoted above).

*Fures* significationem habere a *furvo* . . . quod per obscuras atque atras noctes opportuna sit eis mali effectio . . . Varro ostendit *Rerum Divinarum* lib. XIV . . . Homerus, κλέπτη δέ τε νυκτὸς ἀμείνω. Gellius 1 18 4 quotes the same passage of Varro (which is rightly given in the Harleian MS. from the *Rerum Divinarum*) more fully than Gellius, but does not give the line of Homer. The derivation of *fur* from *furvus* may also be found in Servius G. 3 407, A. 9 350, Placidus 47, Isidore 5 26 18.

*Ventorum proprietates*, etc. This note is an abridgment from one which is given in a fuller form by Gellius 2 22 and Isidore 13 11. Nonius again, however, shows his independence of Gellius by quoting passages of Homer which are not in the latter's note.

P. 51. *Peni*, vel *penoris* (so the Harleian MS.), etc. Gellius 4 1 illustrates the forms and meanings of this word at great length from Q. Scaevola and other jurists. Servius A. 1 703 has a note which gives the pith of Gellius's remarks, but adds instances from Horace, Plautus, and Persius.

*Laevum* significari veteres voluerunt quasi a levando. Vergilium quoque sub hac ostentatione posuisse veteres putant (so Harl.). Georgicorum lib. IV 'si quem Numina laeva sinunt, auditque vocatus Apollo.' Ennius *Annalium* lib. III, 'olli de caelo laevum dedit inclutus signum.' Gellius 5 12 13 gives the opposite interpretation of *laevus* in the line from Vergil; Ennius he does not quote at all. Servius G. 4 6 agrees with Nonius. See further Servius A. 2 54, 693; 9 631.

*Rudentes* ea causa sapientissimi dictos volunt, quod funes, cum vento verberentur, *rudere* existimentur; atque hunc sonum proprium funium, non asinorum putant. Festus 265 *rudentes* vestes nauticae, et asini cum voces mittunt. Comp. Isidore 19 4 1.

*Infesti* proprietatem hanc esse Nigidius voluit, quasi nimium festinantis ad scelus vel ad fraudem. The note of Nigidius is given in full by Gellius 9 12 6. In like manner the following note of Nonius on *maturare* is given fully from Nigidius by Gellius 10 11.

*Lictoris* proprietatem a ligando dictum vetustas putat; ita enim carnificis officium antiquitas fungebatur. M. Tullius pro Rabirio. Gellius 12 3 gives the same explanation as Nonius, quoted from Valgius Rufus, and a different one from Tiro. Paulus 115, *lictiores* dicuntur quod fasces virgarum ligatos ferunt. Hi parentes magistratibus delinquentibus plagas ingerunt.

P. 52. The note on *soror*=Gellius 13 10, where Nigidius is quoted on *frater*. It may therefore come from Nigidius.

*Lues* a rebus solvendis proposita. Licinius Macer Annalibus lib.

II. Paulus 120 *lues* est diluens usque ad nihil, tractum a Graeco λύειν. Comp. Isidore 4 6 19. Placidus 60 *lues*, solves.

The following note on *humanitas* is given more fully by Gellius 13 7, but differently worded, Gellius having no mention of *comitas*.

*Ador* frumenti genus quod epulis et immolationibus sacris pium putatur, unde et *adorare*, propitiare religiones, potest dictum videri. Varro . . . Vergil. Paulus 3 and Isidore 17 3 6 connect it with *edo*.

The following note on *facies*=Gellius 13 20, but Gellius gives the quotations in a different order. With the substance of the note may be compared also Isidore 11 1 33, Donatus Eun. 2 3 5, Servius A. 6 560. The next (p. 53), on *vestibulum*, is virtually identical with that in Gellius 16 5, but can hardly be borrowed from it, as Nonius has a passage from the *De Oratore* of Cicero which Gellius has omitted. The note on *vescus* in the same chapter of Gellius is undoubtedly taken ultimately from Verrius Flaccus, and this may also be the case with that on *vestibulum*. The various views of the ancient scholars on this word may also be found in Servius A. 6 273, 2 469, Isidore 15 7 2.

*Bidentes* qui existimant ob eam causam oves a Vergilio dictas quod duos dentes habeant, pessime ac vitiose intellegunt; nam nec duos dentes habent, et hoc quidem genus monstri est. Nonius proceeds to quote Pomponius and Laberius on *bidens*, and Nigidius on *bidental*. Hyginus apud Gell. 16 6, whose note corresponds closely in substance with that of Nonius, does not quote Laberius, and cites Nigidius on *bidentes*, not on *bidental*. Paulus 33 says *bidental* dicebant quoddam templum, quod in eo bidentibus hostiis sacrificaretur. *Bidentes* autem sunt oves duos dentes longiores ceteris habentes. Isidore 12 1 9 *bidentes* vocant eo quod inter octo dentes duos altiores habent: compare further Acron Hor. Od. 3 27 13, A. P. 171, Servius A. 4 57, 6 39. The original note may have come either from Hyginus or from Verrius.

P. 54. The note on *fenus* is given more fully in Gellius 16 12 5: the substance of it is from Verrius: see Paulus 86 *fenus* et *feneratores* et lex de credita pecunia fenebris a fetu dicta, quod crediti nummi alios pariunt, et apud Graecos eadem res τόκος dicitur: so *ib.* 94. The following one upon *recepticius servus* is stated by Gel-

lius from the work of Verrius *De obscuris Catonis*: as a fact it is quoted from the *De Verborum Significatu* by Festus 282. Again Nonius cannot be borrowing from Gellius, as he has a quotation from Cicero *De Oratore* which Gellius knows nothing of.

*Siticines*. This note is preserved in a fuller form by Gellius 20 2.

*Iumentum* a iungendo veteres dictum putant, *g* littera in eo nomine attrita. Nam et *vectabulum* dicunt quod nunc vehiculum dicitur. A curious misunderstanding; Gellius 20 1 28 *iumentum* quoque non id solum significat quod nunc dicitur, sed *vectabulum* etiam, quod adiunctis pecoribus trahebatur, veteres nostri iumentum a iungendo dixerunt. Surely it is impossible here that Nonius had the note of Gellius before him. He seems to think that *vectabulum* stands to *vehiculum* as *iug-mentum* to *iumentum*.

P. 55. Nonius defines the word *arcera*, and illustrates it from Varro. Gellius 20 1 29 defines it in the same way, but does not quote any illustration. Paulus 15, *arcera* genus plaustrum est modici quo homo vectari possit.

*Tropaei* significantiam propriam Varro Bimarco ostendit; 'ideo fuga hostium Graece vocatur τροπή. Hinc spolia capta, fixa in stipitibus, appellantur *tropaea*.' So Servius A. 10 775, Isidore 18 2 3.

*Luxum*, id est vulsum et loco motum, quod nunc *luxatum* ignari latine dicimus. Inde *luxuria*, quia a recta vivendi via sit exclusa et eiecta. Paulus 119, *luxa* membra e suis locis mota et soluta, a quo *luxuriosus*, in re familiari solutus. 120 *luxantur* . . . i. e. luxuriantur. So Isidore 10 160.

*Culinam* veteres coquinam dixerunt, non ut nunc vulgus putat. Varro . . . Plautus. Acron Hor. S. 1 5 38 *culina* dicta est coquina quia ibidem di penates colantur, etc. Isidore 20 10 1 ab igne colendo *culinam* antiqui dixerunt. This is Varro's etymology as quoted by Nonius.

P. 56. *Petauristae* a veteribus dicebantur qui saltibus vel schemis levioribus moverentur, et haec proprietas a Graeca nominatione descendit, ἀπὸ τοῦ πέτασθαι. Varro Epistola ad Caesarem . . . Idem de Vita Populi Romani. Festus 206 *petauristes* Lucilius a petauro appellatos existimare videtur, cum ait 'sicut mechanici cum alto exiluire petauro.' At Aelius Stilo quod in aere volent, etc.

P. 57. *Curiam* a cura dictam Varro designat, de Vita Populi Romani lib. II (so, not III, the Harleian MS). Paulus 119 *curia* locus est ubi publicas curas ferebant, etc. So Isidore 15 2 28.



*Legionum* proprietatem a dilectu militum, etc. So Isidore 9 3 46.

*Enixae*: for this note comp. Placidus 37.

*Remulco* trahes dictum quasi molli et leni tractu ad progressum mulcere. Sisenna Historiarum lib. II. Paulus 279 *remulco* est cum scaphae remis navis magna trahitur. Isidore 19 4 8 illustrates the word from Valgius.

P. 58. *Agilem*, celerem, ab agendo. Sisenna Historiarum lib. III. Isidore 10 6 *agilis* ab agendo aliquid celeriter, sicut docilis.

*Expediti* et *impediti* ex una proprietate habent vocabuli causam, aut exsolutis pedibus aut inligatis. Sisenna Historiarum lib. IV. Donatus And. 3 5 11, *impeditus* proprie est qui ita pedes habet inligatos ut progredi non possit.

*Testudines* sunt loca in aedificiis camerata, ad similitudinem aquatilium testudinum, quae duris tergoribus sunt et incurvis. Vergil . . . Sisenna. Compare Servius A. 1 505, Isidore 15 8 8.

*Adolere* verbum est proprie sacra reddentium, quod significat votis vel supplicationibus numen auctius facere, ut est in iisdem *Macte esto*. Vergil. Servius A. 1 704 *adolere* proprie est augere, etc.

P. 59. *Accensi* genus militiae est administrantibus proximum. Varro Rerum Humanarum lib. XX. Paulus 18 *accensi* dicebantur qui in locum mortuorum militum subito subrogabantur, dicti ita quia ad censum adiciebantur.

*Nefarius* from *far* (quo scelerati uti non debeant). So Isidore 10 188, both notes coming from Varro.

*Mansuetum* dictum est quasi manu suetum (*mansuetum* Harl.), quod omnia quae sunt natura fera manuum permulsione mitescant. Unde Vergil, etc. Paulus 132 *mansuetum*, ad manum venire solitum. Alii aiunt *mansuetum* dictum neque et misericordia maestum, neque ex crudelitate saevum, sed modestia temperatum.

P. 60. *Rotundum* a rota dictum est, etc. Isidore 20 12 1 *rotundum* a rota vocatum.

*Inepti* proprietatem Cicero de Oratore lib. II patefacit; 'quem enim nos *ineptum* vocamus, is mihi videtur ab hoc nomen habere quod non sit aptus.' Isidore 10 144 *ineptus* apto contrarius est, quasi *inaptus*.

P. 61. *Deversoria* dicta sunt hospitia, a devertendo. Cicero De Oratore lib. II. Isidore 15 3 10, *diversorium* dictum eo quod ex diversis viis ibi conveniatur.

*Heredii* proprietatem indicat Varro De Re Rustica lib. I, 'bina iugera, quod a Romulo primum divisa viritim, quae heredem se-

querentur, heredium appellarunt.' Paulus 99 *heredium*, praedium parvulum. Placidus 52 *herediolum*, possessiunculam.

*Legumina* Varro de Re Rustica lib. I dicta existimat quod non secentur, sed quod legantur. Isidore 17 4 1 *legumina* a legendo dicta, quasi electa.

*Porcae* agri, quam dicimus, significantiam Varro designat De Re Rustica lib. I, 'qua aratrum vomere lacunam striam facit, sulcus vocatur. Quod est inter duos sulcos, elata terra, dicitur *porca*, quod ea seges frumentum porricit.' Accius Parergorum lib. I, 'bene proscissas cossigerare ordine porcas, bidenti ferro rectas deruere.' *Porcae* sunt signa sulcorum quae ultra se iaci semina prohibent: *porcere* enim, prohibere, saepius legimus. Festus 218 *porcae* appellantur rari sulci, qui ducuntur aquae derivandae gratia, dicti quod porcant, id est prohibeant aquam frumentis nocere. Paulus 15 *porcet* dictum ab antiquis quasi porro arcet. Placidus 74 *porcam*, terram quae inter sulcos est elata.

P. 62. *Frasescere*, tamquam friari, et putrefieri vetustate. Varro, De Re Rustica lib. I. Paulus 90 *fracebunt*, displicebunt. Placidus 44 *fracebunt*, sordebunt, displicebunt, dictum de fracibus, qui sunt stillicidia sterquilini.

*Calonum* . . . proprietas haec habetur (so Harl.), quod ligna militibus sumministrent; *καλα* enim Graeci ligna dicunt, ut Homerus, ἐπὶ δὲ ξύλα καλ' ἐπέθευτο. The same account of the word is given by Servius A. 1 39. Porphyrio Hor. Epist. 1 14 42. Paulus 63 somewhat differently: *calones* militum servi dicti quia ligneas clavas ferebant, quae Graeci *καλα* vocant. Is quoque qui huiusmodi telo utitur *clavator* appellatur. In another place (225) he derives it from *calare*: so Porphyrio Hor. S. 1 2 44.

*Conticinium*, noctis primum tempus, quo omnia quiescendi gratia conticescunt. Isidore 5 31 8=Placidus 70, *conticinium* est quando omnia silent, *conticescere* enim silere est. Comp. Servius (Dan.) A. 3 587.

*Delibratum*, decorticatatum, ut *deartuatum*, per artus discissum. Paulus 73 *delubrum* . . . delibratum, id est decorticatatum.

P. 63. *Grumae* sunt loca media, in quae directae quatuor congregantur et conveniunt viae. Est autem *gruma* mensura quaedam, qua fixa viae ad normam (*lineam*, Harl.) deriguntur, ut est agrimensurorum et talium. Ennius . . . Lucilius. Paulus 96 *gruma* appellatur genus machinulae cuiusdam, quo regiones agri cuiusque cognosci possunt.

*Luculentum*, pulchrum et bonum et perspicuum; dictum a luce. Licinius Macer . . . Plautus Cornicularia. Paulus 120 *luculentus* a luce appellatus. Isidore 10 154 *luculentus* ab eo quod sit lingua clarus et sermone splendidus.

P. 64. *Convicium* dictum est quasi e vicis iocum, qui, secundum ignobilitatem loci, maledictis et dictis turpibus cavillentur. Paulus 41 *convicium* a vicis, in quibus prius habitatum est, videtur dictum, vel immutata littera quasi convocium.

*Propages* est series et adfixio continua vel iuge ducta. *Pages* enim compactio, unde *compages*, et *propagare*, id est genus iuge longe mittere. Paulus 227 *propages* progenies a propagando, ut faciunt rustici cum vitem vetulam supprimunt ut ex ea una plures faciant.

P. 65. *Aequor* ab aequo et plano, etc. So Isidore 13 12 1 and elsewhere, Servius A. 2 69, G. 1 50, 469.

*Maeniana* ab inventore eorum Maenio dicta sunt, unde et columna Maenia. Cicero Academicorum lib. IV. Festus 134 *Maeniana* appellata sunt a Maenio censore, qui primus in foro ultra columnas tigna proiecit, quo ampliarentur superiora spectacula.

*Natrices* dicuntur angues natantes. Cicero . . . Lucilius. Isidore 12 4 25 *natrix* serpens aquam veneno inficiens . . . de quo Lucanus 'et natrix violator aquae.'

P. 66. *Manum* dicitur clarum; unde etiam *mane*, post tenebras noctis, diei pars prima; inde Matuta, quae Graece Λευκοθέα. Nam inde volunt etiam deos *Manes* manes appellari, id est bonos et prosperos . . . Inde *immanes* non boni, ut saepe. Paulus 122 *matrem Matutam* antiqui ob bonitatem appellabant, et *maturum* idoneum usui, et *mane* principium diei, et inferi di *manes*, ut suppliciter appellati boni essent, et in carmine Saliari Cerus manus intellegitur creator bonus. So ib. 125, 147: 157-8 he gives an etymology from *manare* (compare Varro L. L. 6 4). For a further version of the note see Servius A. 3 63, and compare also Isidore 5 30 14, 8 11 100, 10 139.

*Fodicare* est fodere, a fodiendo dictum. Cicero. Hence we may perhaps emend Paulus 84 *fodare* fodere, into *fodicare* fodere.

*Praeficae* dicebantur apud veteres quae adhiberi solerent funeri, mercede conductae, ut et flerent et fortia facta laudarent. Plautus in Frivolaria . . . Lucilius . . . Varro. Paulus 223 *praeficae* dicuntur mulieres ad lamentandum mortuum conductae, quae dant ceteris modum plangendi quasi in hoc ipsum praefectae. Naevius. . . . Plautus, it should be observed, is quoted on the same page.

Compare further Servius A. 6 216, 9 486, Acron Hor. A. P. 431. In this case the note of Varro de Lingua Latina (7 70) corresponds far more closely than usual with that of Festus.

P. 67. *Proletarii* dicti sunt plebei, qui nihil reipublicae exhibeant, sed tantum prolem sufficiant. Cato . . . Cassius Hemina. . . . Varro. Paulus 226 *proletarium* capite census, dictum quod ex his civitas constet, quasi prolis progenie; idem et *proletanei*. Gellius in his note on the word (16 10) gives instances different from Nonius.

*Prosapies* generis longitudo, dicta a prosupando aut proserendo. Cato. Festus 225 *prosapia* progenies; id est porro sparsis et quasi iactis liberis, quia *supare* significat iacere et dissicere.

P. 68. *Optiones* in cohortibus qui sunt honesti gradus, ut optatos, quod est electos, et adoptatos, quod adscitos, Varro de Vita Populi Romani lib. III existimat appellari: 'referentibus centurionibus et decurionibus adoptati in cohortes subibant, ut semper plenae essent legiones; a quo optiones in turmis decurionum et in cohortibus centurionum appellati.' Festus 184 *optio* est optatio, sed in re militari *optio* appellatur is quem decurio aut centurio optat sibi rerum privatarum ministrum. 198 *optio* qui nunc dicitur, antea appellabatur accensus. Is adiutor dabatur centurioni a tribuno militum, etc. See further Donatus Eun. 5 8 27, Isidore 9 3 41.

The following notes in this book of Nonius, then, stand in a more or less close relation to notes in Paulus, and may therefore perhaps be referred ultimately to Verrius Flaccus.

P. 1, senium. 3, velitatio, hostimentum. 4, capulum. 5, temulenta. 6, exercitus. 8, nautea, caperare. 9, examussim, focula. 10, bardus, inlex, lurco. 13, veterinus, creperus. 14, vitulans. 15, torrus (?), grumus. 16, expectoro, lacto. 17, strenna (?), adulatio (?), manduco. 18, exdorsua, rumen, rutrum, nebulo. 19, trua. 22, capronae, glisco. 23, saga, lapit, munes, petulantia, procacitas, Kalendae (?). 25, valgus, catax, cilo (?), compernis. 26, lingulaca, rabula. 27, exodium, putus. 29, merenda. 30, antes, camerum, immunis, dirus, exodium. 31, sudus, inritare. 32, arcanum, monumentum, gestire. 34, everriculum (?). 35, angina, privus. 36, depilati, frater. 37, portorium (?). 38, capital. 39, pilare. 40, rabere, tintinnire, verminari, infabre. 41, reserare (?). 42, occatio, locuples. 43, verna, concinnare, viritim. 44, blatero, percontari, cerriti. 45, croccitum, investis. 47, exporrectum, experrectum (?), cingulum. 48, silicernium, elixum. 49, trosuli. 50, lingulacae. 51, rudentes. 52, lictor (?), lues (?), ador (?). 53, bidentes, fenus.

54, recepticius, arcera. 55, luxus. 56, petaurista. 57, curia, remulco. 58, adolere, accensi. 59, mansuetum(?). 61, heredium, porca. 62, calones. 63, gruma, luculentus. 64, convivium, propages. 65, Maeniana. 66, manus, fodicare(?), praefica. 67, proletarii, prosapies, optio.

The following notes cannot be referred to Verrius Flaccus, but have parallels in Gellius, the commentators of the fourth century, Placidus, and Isidore, and may therefore be regarded as coming from the same sources as those corresponding notes:

P. 3, Phrygiones. 6, pellices, calvitur. 9, mutus. 11, concenturio. 12, exsul. 13, haustum. 14, Avernus, extorris. 15, torrus. 17, deliro. 20, incorporare. 21, cernuus, caries. 24, ignominia, fides. 25, seditio. 26, strabo. 27, exterminatus. 28, edulia. 29, calces, mediocritas. 30, modestia. 32, tormina, involare. 33, segnis. 34, interpolare. 35, arquatus. 37, aqua intercus, maltha, sedulo. 38, versipellis, clandestino, elimino. 39, vituperare. 41, tergiversator, prudens. 45, cassus, sublevit. 46, febris. 47, torcular. 48, parochus. 49, cetarii. 50, fures, venti. 51, penus, laevus, infestus, maturare. 52, soror, humanitas, facies. 53, vestibulum. 54, siticines. 55, iumentum, tropaeum, culina. 57, enixae. 58, agilis, impediti, testudo. 59, nefarius. 60, rotundus, ineptus, deversorium. 61, legumen. 62, conticinium. 65, natrix.

HENRY NETTLESHIP.



### III.—NOTES FROM THE GREEK SEMINARY.

#### I.

#### THE ARTICULAR INFINITIVE IN XENOPHON AND PLATO.

In a paper on the articular infinitive, published in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1878, I presented some statistics collected by my pupils and myself as to the usage of Homer, Pindar, the Dramatic poets, Herodotos and Thukydides, and more especially the Attic orators. Those who are at the pains to gather statistics are too prone to read results into them, and, as the papers I have recently published have been chiefly statistical, it may seem to some that I too have the census-bureau ideal of philology. Statistic, as has been well said, is a dead thing, if not animated by the spirit that presents the points of view from which the statements are to be made. The phenomena must be vital, must be organic, else counting is of no moment. If the investigator has not a proper appreciation of the object of his search, he occupies no higher place than the notorious Caravella, who has left us a record of all the particles in Aristophanes arranged according to the accent, μέν in one group and μέν in another; or than Bindseil, who in his concordance to Pindar has put ἄς for ἔως under the relative, and made no distinction between ἄν the adverb-preposition and ἄν the particle. The mania of the present time is special syntax, and perhaps I am no more free from it than is any other philologist who desires to work in and with his time; but too much of this research is done by very young men, generally with no adequate knowledge of the history of constructions and often in slavish dependence on the theories of their teachers. In order to raise the structure of historical syntax on a sufficiently broad foundation, a division of the work is necessary. This every one recognizes. But it is important that force should not be wasted, even should M. Renan be right and historical studies be near their end by reason of the exhaustion of material. At all events I have endeavored not to throw away my own time nor the time of others in the observation of phenomena which possess no discernible significance. But the question comes up, Who is to judge of the significance? Do

we not leave too much to the subjective standard? Of course that is the trouble with every department of study into which feeling and imagination enter so largely as they do in the case of language. Familiarity with the current of a language makes the student susceptible to slight changes, unnoticed by those who get their knowledge out of grammars, which generally present illustrations, not proofs, and seldom if ever show any sense of proportion. The total impression of style, if carefully watched, breaks itself up into a series of minor impressions, and statistic comes in to give an exact account of the source of feeling. It is in this way that we can speak of the aesthetics of syntax. Not that I would leave too much to impression. The logical network of categories is often extremely useful; more useful, however, in exclusion, if I may dare say so, than in inclusion, for although students are aware theoretically that languages differ very much in their spheres of expression, many of them fail to discern the blanks in various idioms, and force the unlucky Greek or the unlucky Latin to assume shapes unknown to the peoples who used these tongues. So parallel syntaxes are found full of enforced parallelisms which a proper use of categories would have excluded.<sup>1</sup> The Greek did not want a parallel to the Latin, nor the Roman to the Greek. Translation is not made by parallels but by equivalents.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A good many years ago, when I was nursing the project of a parallel syntax of Greek and Latin, I sent for a book then recently published, half hoping, half fearing to find the work done to my hand. The book still figures in "complete" lists of grammars, and a word of warning may be not in vain. The author is a Dr. Havestadt, evidently an admirer of Bäumlein, and the book was published in Emmerich, 1863. Such ignorance of Greek I have seldom encountered in any quarter to which one might look for light, although the ignorance does not yield such delicious nonsense as one finds, for instance, in the "key" to a very popular Greek prose composition. So Cic. Off. 1, 14: sunt multi qui eripiunt aliis *quod* aliis *largiantur* is rendered by Havestadt πολλοί εἰσιν, οἱ ἀναρπάζουσιν ἄλλοις (oder gewöhnlicher: ἀναρπάζοντες), ἃ ἄλλοις δωρῶνται; and 3, 5: sibi ut quisque malit, quod ad usum vitae pertineat, quam alteri acquirere concessum est, *non repugnante natura* = μὴ οὐκ ἐναντιοῦσης τῆς φύσεως = ohne dass die Natur im Widerspruche ist. Tusc. 1, 39: Natura dedit usuram vitae, tamquam pecuniae, *nulla praestituta die* = μὴ οὐκ ἀποτεταγμένης τῆς ἡμέρας = ohne dass ein Termin gesetzt wird. I spare the Hellenist the superfluity of *sic*'s and exclamation points.

<sup>2</sup> A Hellenist is prone to exaggerate the influence of Greek on Latin, and yet after making all deductions it is hard to resist the conviction that Latin syntax was sophisticated not only by the adoption of certain Greek constructions, but by the unceasing effort of Roman translators and imitators to reproduce the

The Greek infinitive has a life of its own, and a richer and more subtle development than can be found in any of the cognate languages. This is recognized, I believe, by all professed students of comparative grammar, even by those who only know Greek as it is presented in Kühner. Of course the "ethnic" grammarians are not only proud of this concession, but avail themselves of it to the extent of insisting on a practical independence outside of a limited range of phenomena. The verbalization of the infinitive, so to speak, and the return of the infinitive to the substantive with the retention of its enlarged verb-force, are to be measured inside of the Greek language rather than outside of it. If the ethnic grammarians are over-cautious as to proethnic theories, they err on the right side.

By the substantial loss of its dative force the infinitive became verbalized; by the assumption of the article it was substantivized again with a decided increment of its power. This process adumbrated in Homer we find carried one easy step forward in Pindar. It must have existed among the people long before it was suffered to enter the domain of art. Such expressions as τὸ φαγεῖν, τὸ πιεῖν must have been common far earlier than our record. Philosophers found it a welcome instrument. Parmenides uses it with a certain defiance of law. There are not many τὸ οὐκ εἶναι's in true Greek.<sup>1</sup> Pindar limits himself to the acc. and nom., and uses

effect of Greek combinations, to which the cultivated Romans must have been more sensitive than most of us can pretend to be. So *cum* with the subjunctive, which is a later extension of the relative with the subj., owes much of its popularity to the struggle with the Greek participle, something, perhaps, to the reproduction of the τὸν ὅτι as distinguished from ὅτε; *ut* consecutive is a handy formula for ὥστε with the infinitive; the negative μή brings about the subjunctive, as in the Roman age of Greek the Latin subjunctive brings about the negative μή. Comparatively poor in poetic diction, the Roman poet made amends as the French poet did and still does to some extent by varying the normal order of words. Careful dovetailers like Horace had in this respect as in in others a keen eye to the *exemplaria Graeca*, and the relative has been the greatest sufferer. In Greek poetry—notably in Pindar—the relative can take positions which are seemingly bold, because in Greek we feel the interchangeableness with the demonstrative. There is no such kinship in Latin, and it would not be too daring to say that wherever the interrogative would be forced the relative would be forced.

<sup>1</sup> Parmen. v. 50 οἷς τὸ πέλγειν τε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι ταῦτ' ὃν νομίζονται | καὶ ταῦτόν. In my article "Encroachments of μή on οὐ (American Journal of Philol. I 46), I called Winer's τὸ οὐ φαγεῖν an impossibility, and I am not sorry for it. For such "sports" no one is responsible. So Babrius runs counter to the law of the

these chiefly in the aorist. The dramatic poets vary. Aischylos uses the articular inf. chiefly in the acc. and nom., the tenses are present and aorist; of prepositions he uses very few and these very sparingly; Sophokles employs prepositions a little more frequently, but in him also the tenses are all present or aorist, counting present perfects as presents. Every one knows that Sophokles is highly individual in his syntax, and we have one remarkable instance of a substantivized *oratio obliqua*, Antig. 235, 6:

τῆς ἐλπίδος γὰρ ἔρχομαι δεδραγμένος  
τὸ μὴ παθεῖν ἂν ἄλλο πλὴν τὸ μόρσιμον.

Euripides is even more conservative than his rival in the proportion of his employment of the articular infin. He too uses prepositions and quasi-prepositions very sparingly and keeps to the present and aorist tenses. The construction had not yet become pliant enough for his purpose. Aristophanes is a more difficult problem, because the parodic element enters and the popular as well. He uses the articular infinitive less frequently than Aischylos and Sophokles, but still much oftener than Euripides. The bulk consists of nominatives and accusatives. The tenses are present and aorist. Prepositions are sparingly employed.

To turn to prose. Herodotos uses the articular infinitive very rarely in comparison with Thukydides, who was the first writer to appreciate its possibilities. The tenses used are present and aorist; the perfect once, of resulting condition, nearly = present (4, 6). There are few prepositions, and the examples increase toward the end of the work. The bulk of Thukydides is only six to Herodotos' seven, and yet he uses the articular infinitive more than eight times as

language when he says, 50, 1: ὁ δ' οὐ προδῶσεν ὤμνῃ. Who cares? I may add in this obscure corner that the article referred to was wrung from me by the necessity of making a beginning with the Journal, most of my friends having left me in the lurch. Hence the extreme modesty with which I presented my results. I only used Lucian as an *a fortiori* argument. If such a thing is done in such an author, what must one not expect in writers far inferior to Lucian? I had watched the phenomena for many years, and had stated my results three years before in my commentary to Justin Martyr; and while I shared the regret of some of my critics that I had limited the exhibit to Lucian, I did not require the admonition of Dr. E. Ziegeler, who informed me in the *Philologische Rundschau* of April 30, 1881, that "ὅτι μή is the regular construction after verbs of emotion in older Greek," to the damage of his own reputation for scholarship in the eyes of those who do not accept the uniform "Alles-besserwissen" of German critics of low degree as well as high.

often and with great freedom. The genitive and dative are liberally employed. Instead of a sparing use of prepositions he indulges in the construction without stint (fifteen different prepositions), and absolutely riots in the use of *διὰ τό*. Present and aorist tenses preponderate, but the perfect is also used, and, which is especially worthy of note, the articular future infinitive and the articular inf. with *άν*. Thus the spoils of *oratio obliqua* are appropriated by the resuscitated and reinvigorated nominal infinitive. It is a bold use, and found few imitators in the whole range of the classic tongue. In the rest of my paper, which I am now summarizing for the better appreciation of some new statistics, I presented the results of some researches which I instituted into the usage of the orators. Taking the Teubner page as a standard, it will be found that the occurrences are at least approximately :

Lysias . . . . .	.12
Andokides . . . . .	.20
Isaios . . . . .	.25
Aischines . . . . .	.30
Antiphon . . . . .	.50
Lykurgos . . . . .	.60
Isokrates . . . . .	.60
Deinarchos . . . . .	.80
Demosthenes (private orations) . . . . .	.80
“ (public orations) . . . . .	1.25

I shall not here repeat my interpretation of these facts. If the figures mean anything, they mean that the use of the articular inf. is not simply a matter of period, but a matter of individual character and artistic school.

Two of the members of my Greek seminary have undertaken of their own motion to fill the gaps in my presentation by looking up the usage of Xenophon and Plato. The Platonic statistic is, of course, much complicated by the question of genuineness, and the young investigator, who did the Platonic work as a *πάρεργον* to an exhaustive study of *ἐπί* in the same author, has limited his range to the dialogues accepted by Teuffel. Plato's syntax is so various, it holds in solution so much, it suggests so much conscious playing with language, that no author requires a more circumspect handling. Von Stein well says that Plato writes an ideal style for an ideal reader. A man devoid of humor has no business with Plato, as he can have very little pleasure in him; and the grammarian who is not willing to be surprised and tickled should shut himself up with Isokrates, although even Isokrates



plays us tricks at times, startles us by a picturesque expression, and puzzles us by an anomalous negative and an erratic participle.

The papers to which I refer were written, the one on Xenophon by George Frederick Nicolassen, Ph. D., the other by Mr. W. S. Fleming, Scholar of the Johns Hopkins University, and I take from each of these essays such points as seem to me of special interest in connexion with the statements already made. From Mr. Nicolassen's paper on the articular infinitive in Xenophon it appears that the tenses in Xenophon are mostly the present and the aorist, as was to be expected, sometimes the perfect, and in a few instances the fut. inf. and the inf. with *ἄν* due to the influence of *oratio obliqua*. So Fut.: Anab. 2, 4, 19; 3, 2, 24; Mem. 2, 1, 18 (with *ἐλπίς*); Conv. 3, 3 (with *ἀντιλέγει*). Inf. with *ἄν*: Hell. 1, 4, 20; 3, 3, 6; Mem. 3, 13, 1; Vect. 3, 7 (*οὐ δύσελπίς εἰμι*). Of the cases the nom. and accusative largely preponderate. Then comes the genitive, which is freely used. It is freely used by Euripides, we shall see it freely used by Plato, and Mr. Nicolassen notes especially the comparatively rare construction of the articular infinitive as gen. absolute (Mem. 2, 7, 8). The rarity is doubtless due to the fact that the natural construction would be the simple inf. with the acc. participle. The articular inf. with the acc. participle is also rare (Cyr. 2, 2, 20). Prepositions appear in great numbers and variety. Prepositions proper: *ἀντί*, *ἀπό*, *ἐξ*, *πρό*, *ἐν*, *εἰς*, *διά* with gen. and acc., *ὑπέρ* with gen., *ἐπί* with dat. and acc., *περί* with gen. and acc., *πρός* with dat. and acc. Prepositions improper: *ἐνεκα*, *ἄνευ*, *μέχρι*, *ἐγγύς*, *ἄμα*. *Διά* with the accus. is a favorite as it was with Thukydidēs; while *εἰς*, though frequently used, is not used in overwhelming numbers, as in certain spheres of later Greek. Mr. Nicolassen's table of percentages is interesting:

	Pages (Teubner ed.)	Art. Inf.	Av.
Anabasis	. . . 244	89	.36
Hellenica	. . . 275	137	.49
Cyropaed.	. . . 318	372	1.17
Mem.	. . . 142	254	1.79
Oec.	. . . 71	82	1.15
Conv.	. . . 38	50	1.32
Hier.	. . . 25	47	1.88
Agésil.	. . . 32	57	1.78
R. L.	. . . 21	42	2.
R. A.	. . . 13	4	.31
Vect.	. . . 16	17	1.06

Hipp.	.	.	.	24	64	2.67
Eq.	.	.	.	27	51	1.89
Cyn.	.	.	.	36	28	.75
Apol.	.	.	.	8	19	2.38
				<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
				1290	1313	Gen. Av. 1.02

The difference between the maximum in the Hipparchikos (2.67) which comes into the neighborhood of Demosthenes' highest range (First Olynthiac 2.75) and the Resp. Athen. is noteworthy, especially in view of the manifest un-Xenophontean character of the latter, which is generally assigned to an earlier period. Of course Mr. Nicolassen has not failed to notice this low average, "which is less than the average in the Cynegeticus, which among the minor works has the next lowest average (.75), and far below the average of all the minor works together 1.48," and he justly considers this point to have cumulative weight. The Kynegetikos, I would add, is grammatically a remarkable production, and I have always thought that some of its peculiarities were due to the conservatism of the language of ventry.<sup>1</sup> Xenophon in his way has considerable

<sup>1</sup>I have purposely avoided making any critical application of the statistics given above except in the case of the notorious Republic of the Athenians. Dr. Lincke, the author of the tract on the Oikonomikos, reviewed by Professor C. D. Morris in Vol. I, pp. 169-186 of this Journal, has recently published an article, *Zur Xenophonkritik*, which is not without interest (*Hermes*, XVII 2). A summary of it will be given in an early number of the Journal. The main theme of the paper is the composition of the *Anabasis* and the *Kynegetikos*. Dr. Lincke does not seem to be acquainted with Professor Seymour's essay on the *Kynegetikos* published in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* for 1878, and limits his *ἀνέτησις*, as others have done before him, to the opening and closing chapters. According to Dr. Lincke, the editor of both *Anabasis* and *Kynegetikos* knew Xenophon personally and heard and learned much from him. This would account for the general Xenophontean character, while the variations are to be ascribed to the "hollow head" of the youthful admirer and imitator. But I leave Xenophontean critics to deal with Dr. Lincke, whose method in this essay seems to be as unsatisfactory as it was in the other. Still it must be conceded to the aggressive critics that a work like the *Kynegetikos* would lend itself very readily to interpolations, indeed almost as readily as a book of recipes; but Xenophon himself was so impressionable that too much stress must not be laid on inconsistency of style. What if the *Kynegetikos* does produce the effect, now of rude notes taken down from hunters, now of sophistic ornamentation got up by the composer of the treatise? The combination of high-flown rhetoric, homely realism and absurd story-telling is not peculiar to the sportsman Xenophon, and curious parallels might be adduced from the hunting literature of modern times and, in fact, of our own

variety, but a variety which is due not so much to the artistic mobility of a genius like Plato as to the *laissez-aller* of an antique soldier of fortune, and it is only when he gathers himself up that it is fair to compare him with those who are the true representatives of Attic prose-speech at its conscious best—the Attic orators. If we examine the speeches and the portraits of Anabasis and Hellenika, the low averages above given will disappear, as a very slight inspection of the occurrences will show.<sup>1</sup>

Of especial interest is Mr. Nicolassen's comparison of Xenophon with Thukydides. The average of Thukydides is .98, that of Xenophon 1.02. The slight difference may be accounted for, as Mr. Nicolassen accounts for it, by the philosophical character of so many of Xenophon's writings, as witness the large percentage of the *Kyrupaideia* and the *Memorabilia*. In my essay on the articular infinitive I said that I was very much inclined to think that Xenophon was influenced by Thukydides, and I am not surprised to find that while the average of *διά* with the articular inf. falls a little below that of Thukydides, who has a mania for it, still it rises to its height in the *Hellenika*, as Mr. Nicolassen notes.

In making this comparison with Thukydides, Mr. Nicolassen has had to rely on Forssmann, *De infinitivi temporum usu Thucydideo* (Curtius' Studien VI 1), although he has detected Forssmann in some inaccuracies. Of course absolute accuracy is desirable in everything, but approximate results are not without their interest and value. Sometimes when the preponderance is enormous we can afford to neglect the small dust of the balance. In Xenophon's case, all that can be expected is the exhibition of a general coincidence with the standard language. A model Xenophon has long ceased to be, even though in some eyes he has gained a more human interest by the ruthless treatment he has of late

day. While looking into Mr. Nicolassen's examples I note that the twenty-seven examples in the *Kynegetikos* are distributed thus: Nom. 5, 34; 6, 8; 12, 19; 13, 4. Acc. 5, 28. Gen. 6, 4; 7, 9; *ἀπό* w. gen. 4, 4; *ἀνευ* w. gen. 4, 10; *ἐγγίς* w. gen. 12, 5; *διά* w. acc. 5, 5; 5, 9; 8, 3; 8, 8; 9, 10; 9, 17; 10, 22; 12, 2; 12, 3 (*bis*); 12, 6; 12, 7; 12, 16; 12, 21; *ἐπί* w. acc. 12, 15, with dat. 13, 8; *πρός* w. acc. 5, 27. The introduction has none, eleven are crowded into the last chapters (argumentative). *Διά* with acc. has its large Xenophontean share.

<sup>1</sup> Take for instance the nom. art. inf. list of the *Anabasis*: 1, 9, 24 (*bis*); 2, 1, 4; 2, 4, 19; 2, 5, 15; 2, 6, 14 (*bis*); 3, 2, 39 (*bis*); 5, 2, 9; 5, 6, 32; 5, 8, 15; 6, 1, 26; 6, 5, 17 (*bis*); 6, 5, 18; 7, 7, 26; 7, 7, 28. All these examples with only one exception, and that really no exception, occur in speeches or elaborate characteristics.

received. I have been careful not to make a minute abstract of Mr. Nicolassen's essay, which will be prepared for publication in another form, perhaps in connexion with a treatise on the whole subject from the beginning of Greek literature to the close of the oratorical canon.

Mr. W. S. Fleming's notes on the articular infinitive in Plato go into less detail than Mr. Nicolassen's essay, and are restricted, as I have said, to the dialogues considered genuine by Teuffel, thus excluding with others, for which little can be said, the Menexenos and the Parmenides. Plato uses twenty-five prepositions and quasi-prepositions as against fifteen in Thukydides. Among the more uncommon I note *κατά* (eight times). The genitive is nearly as common as the nominative (415:468). The acc. leads (632). The dative is much less frequent than the others. In phrases the infinitive itself is often a dative still. The gen. absol. construction occurs Crito 44 D, Polit. 310 E, Euthyd. 285 D, Gorgias 509 C. In the dialogues examined the articular present infinitive is much more common than the aorist, occurring in fact nine times oftener. This is a marked contrast to the Pindaric use, where the aorist is to the present as seven out of ten. But the Pindaric preponderance of the aorist generally I shall myself consider before long in a special paper. Plato's large use of the present is doubtless due to the philosophical consideration of the character of the action rather than its manifestation. If we exclude present perfects from the list of articular perfect infinitives, such as *τὸ τεθνάναι*, *τὸ μεμνησθαι* and the like, the articular perf. inf. shrinks to a small fraction of the usage. The articular future inf. is rare, twice dependent on *ἐλπίς* Phaedo 68 A, Philebus 36 A; once on *παράδειγμα*, Legg. 664 A. The articular inf. with *ἄν* is also rare. Four out of seven examples are in the Laws, which, I would add, are rich in grammatical oddities. See Phaedo 62 C, Symp. 174 B, Resp. 501 A, Legg. 790 A (*bis*), 879 D, 941 D.

I have allowed myself to present in this bare outline the chief results of the work of these young men in connexion with what I myself have done in this direction, because I am sure that there are many who take a sufficient interest in Greek grammar to follow the history of so important a construction in its larger manifestations, and perhaps even those who value Greek only as an exemplification of general grammatical laws will not be indifferent to this vindication, imperfect as it is, of the reserved rights of the special language and the individual author. Even without putting

into print the enormous mass of material, enough has been done to show that the "foundations of Greek Syntax" in this quarter must be laid on firmer soil than is to be found in any general treatise, however "ausführlich." No language can ever be learned to the end; but it is to be hoped that the younger generation of Greek scholars will not suffer as much reproach to rest on them as rests on their seniors, who have had to learn within my memory some matters which in other languages would be considered elementary.

## II.

ὅ μὴ.

In my edition of the Apologies of Justin Martyr (Harper & Brothers, 1877), I used the notes as a *cache* for various grammatical formulae and observations, some of which I have since endeavored to justify in the pages of this journal. Among the difficult combinations thus summarily treated is *ὅ μὴ*, on which I made some remarks which I will repeat here.

I, c. 38. *ὅ μὴ αἰσχυρθῶ*: This emphatic form of the negative (*ὅ μὴ*) is far more common in the LXX and in the N. T. than it is in classic Greek. This tendency to exaggeration in the use of an adopted language is natural. For Hebrew analogies see Ewald, *Lehrbuch*, S. 320 *a*. The *fact* is that *ὅ μὴ* with the aor. subj. (very seldom with any other tense) is used as a strong negative of the future. The common *explanation* is that a verb or phrase of fear or apprehension is to be supplied. If this be true, the consciousness of it must have been utterly lost, as the expression is often used when the notion of fear or apprehension would be unnatural to the last degree. The practical limitation to the aorist seems to indicate that the expression was originally imperative (comp. the use of *נ* in Hebrew), *ὅ* being a free negative.<sup>1</sup> 'Nay, let me not be ashamed.' Afterwards the imperative notion became fainter. It might seem easier to make *ὅ* belong to *αἰσχυρθῶ*, thus combining objective and subjective negatives, but it must be remembered

<sup>1</sup> According to my judgment the standing perplexity about *οὐκ οὖν*, *οὐκοῦν*, *οὐκοῦν* is to be solved by the varying use of the negative *οὐκ* now as free, *i. e.* referring to the substance of what goes before, now as bound to the following verb. As free, *οὐκ* would be 'nay,' as bound, 'not.'



that *οὐ* with the subjunctive had died out (except in *μή οὐ*) before this construction came in.<sup>1</sup>

I, c. 39. *οὐ μή λήφονται* = *οὐ μή λάβωσι*. *Οὐ μή* w. fut. indic. is most frequently used in the second person as a strong imperative. Here it is employed as a strong prediction. The combination is commonly explained as an interrogative and *οὐ* is made to negative the *μή*. This theory of Elmsley's would require *οὐ—οὐ* as in Xen. Hell. 5. 2, 33.<sup>2</sup> A more simple explanation regards *οὐ* and *μή* as both belonging to the future (Goodwin<sup>3</sup>). But satisfactory examples of the future indicative in an imperative sense are rare. Perhaps it may be best to consider *οὐ* as 'nay!' (see note on c. 38, 9) and *μή* as an interrogative expecting a negative answer.

The foregoing brief statement I subsequently expanded for a special purpose, and this expanded form I now reproduce with a few additional notes.

*Οὐ μή*, in independent sentences, combining as it does both the negative of the statement and the negative of will, carries with it a tone of special personal interest, whether in prediction or in prohibition. *Οὐ μή* is used

I. in negative predictions.

a. with Subj.

I. chiefly aor. *οὐ τι μή ληφθῶ δόλφ* Aesch. S. c. T. 38, cf. 199, 281, Cho. 895; *οὐ τοι σ' Ἀχαιῶν . . . μή τις ὑβρίσῃ* Soph. Ai. 560, cf. El. 42, 1029, Phil. 103, O. R. 771, O. C. 450, 1023; *οὐ τι μή φύγητε λαιψηρῶ ποδί* Eur. Hec. 1039, cf. H. F. 718; *οὐ γὰρ μή ἀπόσσηται* Hdt. 1, 199,

<sup>1</sup> *Οὐ μή* startles us when it appears in Parmenides, *e. g.* v. 121 (Mull.): *ὥς οὐ μή ποτέ τις σε βροτῶν γνώμη παρελάσσει*. The combination has evidently worked its way up from familiar language. So it occurs in the mouth of the Scythian archer Ar. Thesmoph. 1108: *οὐκὶ μή λαλήσει σύ*.

<sup>2</sup> *Οὐκ—οὐκ ἠθέλησαν συστρατεύειν*;

<sup>3</sup> Professor Goodwin has assured me that his views are not so definite as I have represented them to be, and the only apology I can offer for the wrong I have unintentionally done him is to reproduce the language of his *Moods and Tenses*, p. 187: 'The rules given above consider the subjunctive there [*οὐ μή τοῦτο γένηται*] a relic of the common Homeric subjunctive (§ 87) [where it is said to have the force of a weak future], and explain the fut. in § 89, 2 [*οὐ μή λαλήσεις*] by the principle stated in § 25, 1 N. 5 [where the fut. ind. with *μή* is said to express a prohibition]—*οὐ μή* having the same force of a strong single negative in both constructions.' From this statement I inferred, wrongly as it seems, that the strong single negative was the result of the fusion of *οὐ γένηται* and *μή γένηται*, of *οὐ λαλήσεις* and *μή λαλήσεις*, and so attributed to Professor Goodwin the assumption of a genesis which is at all events intelligible.

cf. 7. 53; οὐ μὴ . . ἐσβάλωσιν Thuc. 4. 95, cf. 5. 69; οὐ μὴ ποθ' ἀλῶ Ar. Ach. 662; οὐ μὴ ποτε δέξηται Plat. Phaedo 105 D, cf. Phaedr. 227 D, 260 E, etc.; οὐ μὴ κρατηθῶ Xen. Cyr. 5. 1, 17, cf. 3. 2, 8; cf. οὐδεὶς μὴ ποθ' εὖρη κατ' ἐμὲ οὐδὲν ἐλλειφθέν Dem. 18. 246.

2. rarely present, οὐ μὴ ποτε . . φυγόντες . . ἐπεύχωνται θεοῖς (v. l. ἐπεύξωνται) Soph. O. C. 1024—(φυγόντες will serve as if=οὐ μὴ φύγωσι); οὐ μὴ δύνηται Xen. Cyr. 8. 1, 5 (v. l. δυνήσεται), cf. also An. 2. 2, 12, Hier. 11. 15; οὐ μὴ εἰσίης (εἴσει εἰς, Bekk.) Isae. 8. 24; οὐ μὴ οἶός τ' ἦς Plat. Rep. 1. 341 C; οὐ γὰρ μὴ δυνατὸς ᾧ Id. Phil. 48 D.

οὐ μὴ with subj. is commonly explained by the ellipsis of a verb or phrase of fear or apprehension; cf. οὐ γὰρ ἦν δεινὸν . . μὴ ἀλφῶ κοτε Hdt. 1. 84, cf. 7. 235, Ar. Eccl. 650, Xen. Comm. 2. 1, 25, etc., Plat. Apol. 28 B, Phaedo 84 B, Gorg. 520 D, Rep. 5. 465 B. In many passages, however, fear or apprehension would be unsuitable or unnatural (as Eur. I. T. 18<sup>1</sup>, I. A. 1465<sup>2</sup>), and the combination was hardly felt as an ellipsis, as is shown by its use after ὅτι Thuc. 5. 69, 2, Xen. Hell. 4. 2, 3, Plat. Rep. 6. 499 B; after ὥς *since*, Ar. Av. 461, and after ὥστε Plat. Phaedr. 227 D. Notice also that in Dem. 9. 75 δέδοικα is expressed in the *next* clause. The prevalence of the aor., though not unnatural after verbs of fear, would seem to indicate that the original combination was that of a declarative neg. οὐ, *nay!* and a prohibitive subj., which afterwards became a mere phraseological future, showing, however, a special interest in the action. Comp. Engl. *shall*.

b. with fut. indic. οὐ σοι μὴ μεθέψομαι ποτε Soph. El. 1052, cf. O. C. 177, 849 (for which in oratio obliqua fut. opt. ἐθέσπισεν ὥς οὐ μὴ ποτε πέρσοιεν Soph. Phil. 611; or fut. inf. εἶπεν . . οὐ μὴ ποτε . . εὖ πράξειν πόλιν Eur. Phoen. 1590); οὐ μὴ σ' ἐγὼ περιόψομαι Ar. Ran. 508; οὐ μὴ δυνήσεται Κῦρος εὐρεῖν Xen. Cyr. 8. 1, 5, cf. Hell. 1. 6, 32. A phraseological outgrowth from II.

II. in prohibitions with fut. indic. (chiefly 2d person) οὐ μὴ ἔξεγερεῖς τὸν ὕπνῳ κάτοχον (;) Soph. Tr. 978; οὐ μὴ μῦθον ἐπὶ πολλοὺς ἐρεῖς (;) Eur. Supp. 1066, cf. Andr. 757, El. 982, Hipp. 213, Bacch. 343; οὐ μὴ πρόσει τούτοισιν ἐσκοροδισμένοις (;) Ar. Ach. 166, cf. Nub. 367, Vesp. 397. MS. subjunctives in such passages (*e. g.* σκώψῃς . . ποιήσῃς, Ar. Nub. 296) have generally been changed by editors into

<sup>1</sup> Ἀγάμεμνον, οὐ μὴ ναῦς ἀφορμήσῃ χθονός,  
πρὶν ἂν κόρην σὴν Ἴφιγένειαν Ἀρτεμὶς  
λάβῃ σφαγεῖσαν.

<sup>2</sup> ΚΑΥΤ. ὦ τέκνον, οἶχει; ΙΦ. καὶ πάλιν γ' οὐ μὴ μὀλω.

fut. indic. The prohibition is continued by *καί* (Soph. Tr. *l. c.*) or by *μηδέ*: *οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα μηδ' ἄψει πέπλων* (;) Eur. Hipp. 606, cf. Ar. Nub. 296, Ran. 298. A positive command is added by *ἀλλά*: *οὐ μὴ λαλήσεις ἀλλ' ἀκολουθήσεις ἐμοί* Ar. Nub. 505, cf. Ran. 462, 524, Eur. Bacch. 782; or *δέ*: *οὐ μὴ προσοίσεις χεῖρα βακχεύσεις δ' ἰών*, Eur. Bacch. 348; cf. Med. 1151, El. 384.

Elmsley regarded *οὐ μὴ* with fut. indic. as an impatient question, in which *οὐ* negatives *μὴ*, but this would require *οὐ—οὐ*, cf. Xen. Hell. 5. 2, 33. *οὐ* and *μὴ* are sometimes regarded as belonging separately to the fut. either *you will not, nay, you shall not*, (but *μὴ* with fut. indic. as an imperative is too rare), or *you will not, will you?* in which *οὐ* anticipates the negative answer to the following question. Perhaps *οὐ* is an independent negative, *nay*, which introduces a free objection not yet distinctly formulated, while *μὴ* introduces a question which expects a negative answer, so that an original *οὐ, μὴ . . .* became ultimately *οὐ μὴ*. Compare the way in which *οὐ τί που* hovers between question and statement. The rule of Dawes which excludes the use of 1 aor. subj. act. or med. after *οὐ μὴ* can only be upheld by unreasonable emendations, cf. *οὐ μὴ ποτε . . . ἐκφύγω* Soph. O. R. 329; *οὐ μὴ ἐκπλεύσης* (fut. unmetrical) Phil. 381, cf. Ai. 560; *οὐ μὴ ποτέ τι ἀπολέση* (fut. ἀπολεί) Plat. Rep. 10. 609 A; *οὐδεὶς μηκέτι μένῃ* Xen. An. 4. 8, 13.

*οὐ* and *μὴ* not unfrequently occur each with its own verb or equivalent. Editors differ with one another and themselves, according as they consider the interrogation to embrace the whole or not. So *οὐ σίγα μηδὲν τῶνδ' ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτόλιν*; Aesch. S. c. T. 250; *οὐ σίγα ; μηδὲν τῶνδ' ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτόλιν*, or *οὐ σίγα ; μηδὲν τῶνδ' ἐρεῖς κατὰ πτόλιν*; As *οὐ* expects a positive and *μὴ* a negative answer, we only have another phase of a common law of grouping (positive followed by equivalent negative), and gain nothing for the explanation of *οὐ μὴ*, cf. Soph. Ai. 75, Tr. 1183, O. R. 637, Eur. Hipp. 498, Hel. 438, Plat. Conv. 175 A.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

IV.—GREEK INSCRIPTION FROM GERASA IN SYRIA.

The Rev. Dr. Selah Merrill has kindly placed in my hands a paper rubbing and a field-copy of

ΙΟΥΛΙΑΝΗΝΟΥΤΟ  
 ΚΕΥΘΕΙΤΑΦΟΣΗΝ  
 ΚΕΡΕΙΖΕΝΕΣΧΑ  
 ΤΑΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ  
 5 ΑΘΛΑΤΙΝΩΝΓΑΥΖΗΙ  
 ΟΥΜΕΤΑΔΕΥΡΟΜΟΛΟΥ  
 ΑΠΟΠΑΡΙΔΟΣΑΝΤΙΟ  
 ΧΕΙΡΟΥΚΕΤΙΠΡΟΣΠΑ  
 ΤΗΚΩΔΑΓΕΛΕΥΣΕΘΑΛΛ  
 10 ΑΛΛΕΛΑΧΕΝΑΙΣΕΕΡΑΕ  
 ΜΕΡΟΣΑΝΤΙΟΧΕΙΡΟΥΤ  
 ΤΟΜΗΝΨΥΧΙΑΚΕ  
 ΝΟΝΚΑΕΧΕΙΓΗΥΤΑΤΗ  
 ΜΙΜΝΟΙΣΗΧΩΙΔΨΙΣΗ  
 15 ΑΛΛΕΟΙΣΜΟΨΩΓΑΜΕ  
 ΤΗΠΑΝΟΣΤΟΥΝΣΑ  
 ΒΓΑΡΚΑΕΧΩΒ

the following inscription, from the ruins of Gerasa, the modern Gerash. It is one of a number which he collected in the course of a journey in the Decapolis of Syria in April, 1876. The stone had been dug up the year before "by a man who was making a race-way for his mill." Mr. Merrill speaks of it as "a beautiful monument," and describes the inscription as "finely engraved, and except for the few bruised places well preserved and distinct." The stone, he says, is about four feet high; the inscription itself measures about 33×13 inches.

The dotted lines indicate what is in the field-copy, but does not appear in the

rubbing, which is faint on the right throughout.

Ἰουλιανὴν ο[ὐ]το[ς] | κεύθει τάφος, ἣν | κ[τ]ερείξεν  
 ἔσχα|τα σωφροσύν[ης] | ἀθλα τίνων γα[μέτ]ης |  
 οὐ μέτα δεῦρο μολοῦσ' | ἀπὸ πατρίδος Ἀντιο|χείρης  
 οὐκέτι πρὸς πά|τρην τῷδ' ἀπελεύσεθ' ἄμ[α]. |  
 ἀλλ' ἔλαχεν γαί[ης] [Γ]ερ[ά]σ[ης] | μέρος Ἀντιοχείης,  
 τ[οῦτ]ο, | τό μιν ψυχ[ῆς] σῶμα | κενὸν κατέχει.  
 πρ[η]υτάτῃ | μίμνοις, Ἡχοῖ δ' [ἐπ'] ἴσης | λαλέοις μοι,  
 σ[ὺ] γαμέ|τῃ Πανὸς τοῦν[ομ]α | γὰρ κατέχω.

In lines 2, 5, 13, *κτερεῖξεν, γαμέτης, πρηνιάτη* were suggested by President Woolsey and Professor Packard, who saw a copy last summer; and the Rev. T. O. Paine, whose notes were sent me by Mr. Merrill, had restored *οὔτος, γαίης, τοῦτο, τοῦνομα* (lines 1, 10, 11, 16.)

The fifth verse (of the elegiacs) receives its explanation from an inscription of Pergamum published by Mommsen, *Berichte der sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss.* 1850, p. 223, and Waddington, *Voy. Arch. n.* 1722, in which mention is made of [*Ἀντιο*]χέων τῶν [*ἐπὶ τ*]ῷ Χρυσορόα τῶν π[ρότ]ερον [*Γε*]ρασηνῶν ἢ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆ[μος]. Whence it appears that as early as Trajan's time—for that is the date of the Pergamenian monument—Gerasa had received the new name of 'Antioch on the Chrysorhoas'; and of this our inscription affords a welcome confirmation. Such a change in name resulted naturally, as in so many other cases, from the Hellenization of an old non-Hellenic settlement.<sup>1</sup>

The story of Pan and the nymph Echo may be read in Longus III 23. The sense of the last four words of the epitaph is nevertheless not perfectly clear to me. Does the husband merely liken himself to Pan listening for the voice of the dead nymph? Or are we to understand that his name was Πανόδωρος, or Πανέας, or perhaps Παναίτιος or the like?

The scansion Ἰουλιανῆν (— ∪ ∪ —) is exemplified in the epitaph of the emperor Julian as given by Zosimus III 34:

Ἰουλιανὸς μετὰ Τίγριν ἀγάρροον ἐνθάδε κείται,  
ἀμφοτέρων, βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής

In line 9, ἀπελεύσειθ' is of course ἀπελεύσεται. I hardly know of any monument in which the joining of letters is so systematically carried out as here.<sup>2</sup> Almost no chance of making one upright stroke do duty for two letters without risk of obscurity is neglected. Yet in line 1 HN, line 3 NE, line 4 NH might further have been joined. In line 9 one stroke forms part of three letters (ντω).

Several other inscriptions copied by Mr. Merrill in Syria I hope to make public at an early day.

FREDERIC D. ALLEN.

<sup>1</sup> Mommsen points out that the fifth of Stephanus Byzantius' list of ten cities called Ἀντιόχεια ("πέμπτη μεταξὺ κοίλης Συρίας καὶ Ἀραβίας") may very likely be Gerasa, instead of Gadara as has been commonly supposed.

<sup>2</sup> Yet compare C. I. G. 2007 and 2717.



## NOTES.

### *Malum* AS AN INTERJECTION.<sup>1</sup>

The article referred to below presents two interesting suggestions, (a) that the interjection *malum* is always applied to folly of some kind or degree, and (b) that its use arose from a formal deprecation of such folly. These propositions are supported by an examination of all the cases known to M. Martha. A dozen or more in Plautus, and a few in Cicero, have, however, escaped his notice, and these seem to require a modification of the theory in both its points.

I. The following examples show that *malum* was not invariably associated with folly.

In two cases *malum* expresses impatience at personal inconvenience. In Pseud. I 3, 14 the *leno* calls out to his attendant *quid hoc, malum? tam placide is, puere?* (So Lorenz, after MSS. R. and Fleck. read, *quid malum tam p. i., p.?*) Nothing in the context implies that he thought the slave stupid or foolish, but he wanted to go faster, and the question expresses his impatience at the inconvenience of waiting for a lazy boy. Similar to this is a passage quoted by Martha, Rud. II 6, 8, *quo, malum, properas, Labrax?* His comment is, "Labrax subitement se met à courir sans raison, on le poursuit de ces mots." But the haste is neither sudden nor unreasonable. After the shipwreck Labrax is looking about for Charmides or for the two women who were in the ship with him, and is going quickly across the stage when he is seen by Charmides. Nor does Charmides show that he thinks the haste foolish; on the contrary, he gives the reason for his impatience in the words which follow the question, *nam equidem te nequeo consequi tam strenue*.

Twice *malum* expresses impatience under mishaps. In Capt. III 3, 16, Tyndarus sees Hegio coming with a man who will

<sup>1</sup> Sur le Sens de l'Exclamation *Malum*, by Constant Martha. Rev. de Philologie, Vol. III, 1879, pp. 19-25.

betray his imposture. He exclaims, "Not even Salvation can save me if she wants to." *Quam, malum? quid machiner, quid conminiscar, haereo.* He is simply cursing his bad luck in being confronted with a man who knows his real name. So in Ter. Adolph. IV 2, 5, Demea, who has met with one misfortune after another, cries out, *quid hoc malum infelicitatis! nequeo satis decernere.* Martha explains by speaking of "son malheur inexplicable, absurde," but the bad luck itself is a sufficient cause for impatience, and the words which follow are only an added comment. "What wretched luck this is! I can't make it out."

A passage in Cic. Phil. I 6, 15, unnoticed by Martha, does not bear out his statement, that in the graver writers some word expressive of folly is always found in the context. The words are *quaenam, malum, est ista voluntaria servitus?* and they occur in the midst of a vehement arraignment of the senators for their cowardice. Impatience with subservience is expressed by the question.

In a number of cases the exclamation is called out by impertinent intrusion or interference, *e. g.* Aul. III 2, 15, Rud. IV 3, 8, Cas. I 1, 3, Men. V 2, 42, or by impudence, Epid. V 2, 45, Pseud. V 2, 6. In the last three passages Martha attributes the use of *malum* to irritation at the folly of impudence. Doubtless all impertinence is foolish, but there is nothing in the context to show that the speakers were thinking of this fact. The words *impudentia, ferocia, audacia* put the emphasis upon the thing itself, not upon the folly of it. A striking illustration of this is found in Cic. Verr. II 1, 20, 54, *quae, malum, est ista tanta audacia atque amentia?* Here is a word expressive of folly in the context, yet the whole chapter is spent in contrasting the modesty of the greatest generals with the *audacia*, not the *amentia*, of Verres.

If, then, the theory of M. Martha be accepted, it must be with such an extension of the idea of folly as to make it cover laziness (Pseud.), inconvenient energy (Rud.), bad luck (Capt., Adolph.), impudence (Rud., Aul., Men.), too intrusive friendliness (Phorm. IV 5, 11), audacity and cowardice (Cic.); and wherever various causes for anger come up at the same time, the use of *malum* must be attributed to folly alone. Is it not simpler and at the same time more accurate to say that *malum* expresses impatience, irritation, annoyance, and in general the lighter forms of anger? It is then quite natural to find such slight emotions roused more often by folly than by any other cause. The more serious writers seldom

have occasion to condemn laziness, or anything which causes them simple inconvenience, and they seldom condescend to deplore petty mishaps. In comedy, folly of some kind is the subject matter, and a list as long as Martha's might be made out of passages where *vae* is applied to a foolish joke.

II. This view of the use of *malum* was in part suggested by a doubt of the second point made by Martha, viz. that the interjection arose from a formal deprecation. The word is used more frequently by Plautus than by Terence, and much more frequently by these two than by all other writers together. Cicero uses it in his letters and speeches (the example in *de Off.* is quoted from a letter), Fronto and Seneca in letters, Quintus Curtius in a conversation, and Livy in a speech. The word belongs to colloquial language, and its origin must be sought there. Further, it is not enough to examine its meaning in questions only, and some common substantive uses are therefore classified here without extended comment.

1. *Malum* in the sense of physical punishment, the greatest evil to a slave. This is very common in Plautus and Terence, *e. g.* *Asin.* V 2, 86, *Aul.* IV 10, 71, *Pers.* V 2, 36, 46, 66, *et pass.*

2. A few cases where *malum* means both punishment and misfortune in general. *Pseud.* II 19, III 5, 4, *malum damnumque.* *Amph.* II 1, 13, *malum quod tibi di dabunt, atque ego (Amphitruo) hodie dabo.*

3. *Malum* and *mala res* for misfortune. *Curc.* IV 2, 33. *Curculio* asks, *ecquid das . . . ?* *Cappadox* answers, *malum!* *Poen.* I 2, 59, *i in malam rem!* *Truc.* V 45, *malam rem his et magnam!* "Bad luck to them, and plenty of it!"

4. *Malum* with the same meaning in curses. *Pseud.* IV 7, 29, *malum quod tibi di dabunt: sic scelestu's.* *Most.* III 2, 126, *malum quod isti di deaeque omnes duint!* The same words occur in *Ter. Phorm.* V 8, 83. These lines are sometimes punctuated *malum! quod*, etc., to emphasize the curse and the fact that *quod* does not refer to any preceding idea. Compare also the playful use in *Cic. Att.* IX 18, *tu, malum, inquires actum ne agas.* "You, confound you, will say . . ."

5. *Malum*, still with the same meaning, misfortune or bad luck, in questions. Here it expresses impatience by adding to the question or exclamation a curse at some annoying act or characteristic of the person addressed. This use became formulaic, as is shown by the regularity with which *malum* stands after the interrogative

word and in close connection with *tu*, *hic* or *iste*. In such a formula the original sense determined the speaker's use of it, but was not necessarily present in his mind.<sup>1</sup>

E. P. MORRIS.

#### THOMAS JEFFERSON AS A PHILOLOGIST.

So far as I am aware, no student of English has made a critical examination of the writings of Thomas Jefferson, with a view to ascertain their philological interest or importance. Even his establishment of the chair of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Virginia is not so well known to students of English as it ought to be. It has been but seven or eight years since a well-known American scholar published a list of colleges in which the English tongue was taught, yet omitted all reference to the Virginia University, and Mr. Jefferson's foundation, the oldest on the Western continent, and one of the oldest in the world. No diligent student of Jefferson's miscellaneous letters can fail to discover many striking and suggestive comments upon the English of his time, and some happy glimpses into the real nature of language. The VII volume of his works is peculiarly attractive, as exhibiting the keen interest felt by the author in the study of the mother-tongue. His comments on the introduction of new words, the changes taking place in the English of his day, the propriety of encouraging neologisms, are delightful as a kind of philological recreation, to

<sup>1</sup> The passages given by Martha are the following: Cic. Verr. II 1, 20, Pro Rosc. 18, de Off. II 15, Phil. X 9, Sen. ad Marc. 3, Quint. Curt. VIII 14, 41, Plin. N. H. XXXIII 47, 3, 137, VII 56, 3, 190, Scaurus ap. Euphras. in Ter. Heaut. IV 3, 38, Fronto ad Verum, Frag. 2, p. 11, ed. Naber, Liv. V 54, Plaut. Amph. II 1, 79, 45, 57, Cas. I 1, 3, Rud. II 6, 8, Truc. V 38, Bacch. IV 4, 21, Most. I 1, 6, 33, Pseud. V 2, 6, Epid. V 2, 45, Men. V 2, 42, II 3, 39, Amph. I 1, 247, Ter. Eun. IV 7, 10, Heaut. IV 3, 38, II 3, 77, Adelph. IV 2, 5, 18, Phorm. IV 5, 11, V 8, 55.

To these may be added the following: In questions, Cic. Phil. I 6, 15, Catull. XXIX 21, Plaut. Aul. III 2, 15, Capt. III 3, 18, Curc. IV 2, 33, Cas. II 3, 44, II 8, 36, Bacch. IV 4, 96, Most. II 1, 21, Mil. Glor. II 5, 36, Merc. I 2, 73, Pseud. I 3, 14, Poen. I 2, 48, Rud. IV 3, 8, Stich. IV 2, 17, Truc. II 6, 20, IV 3, 27. In Most. II, 2, 98 the text is doubtful. The substantive use not in questions is very common, but the following passages are worthy of examination: Amph. II 1, 13, Curc. IV 2, 33, Bacch. IV 9, 76, Most. II 2, 96, Men. V 2, 103, Stich. I 3, 105-6. Also Cic. Att. IX 18.

say nothing of their accuracy when considered from a scientific standpoint. Mr. Jefferson was in the prime of his intellect during the last great period of transition in English, the era ushered in by the French revolution, when the forces of "dialectic regeneration" were active in our language, and a long interval of linguistic depression was succeeded by an age of linguistic growth and expansion. The student will find it profitable to compare the VII volume of Jefferson, pages 174, 175, Vol. VI, p. 185, with chapter V, VI, VIII, of Hall's *Modern English*. The portions of Dr. Hall's book to which I refer are too long for insertion here, but this admirable work is accessible to every student, who can make the comparison for himself. Mr. Jefferson is not so well known to students of language as to students of political history, and for that reason, extracts from his works are more appropriate in a philological article, than from Dr. Fitzedward Hall, whose contributions to the history of our language are gratefully appreciated wherever English is a subject of critical study. In Vol. VII, pages 174, 175, Mr. Jefferson, writing to John Adams (1820), thus expresses himself: "These views are so obvious, that I am sure they would have required but a second thought to reconcile the reviewer to their *location* under the head of pure mathematics. For this word *location*, see Bailey, Johnson, Sheridan, Walker, &c. But, if dictionaries are to be the arbiters of language, in which of them shall we find *neologism*? No matter. It is a good word, well sounding and obvious, and expresses an idea which would otherwise require circumlocution. The reviewer was justified, therefore, in using it, although he noted at the same time as unauthoritative, *centrality*, *grade*, *sparse*; all of which have long been used in common speech and writing. I am a friend to *neology*. It is the only way to give a language copiousness and euphony. Without it we should still be held to the vocabulary of Alfred or of Ulphilas; and to their state of science also: for I am sure they had no words which could have conveyed the ideas of oxygen, cotyledons, zoophytes, magnetism, electricity, hyaline, and thousands of others expressing ideas then not existing, nor of possible communication in the state of their language. What a language has the French become since the Revolution, by the free introduction of new words! The most copious and eloquent in the living world, and equal to the Greek, had not that been regularly modifiable almost *ad infinitum*. Their rule was that whenever their language furnished or adopted a root, all its branches in every part of speech



were legitimated by giving them their appropriate terminations. . . . . And this should be the law of every language. Thus having adopted the adjective *fraternal*, it is a root which should legitimate *fraternity*, *fraternation*, *fraternisation*, *fraternism*, to *fraternate*, *fraternise*, *fraternally*. And give the word *neologism* to our language as a root, and it should give us its fellow substantives, *neology*, *neologist*, *neologisation*; its adjectives, *neologous*, *neological*, *neologicalist*; its verb *neologize*; and adverb, *neologically*. Dictionaries are but the depositories of words already legitimated by usage. Society is the workshop in which new ones are elaborated. When an individual uses a new word, if ill formed, it is rejected in society; if well formed, adopted, and after due time, laid up in the depository of dictionaries. And if, in this process of sound neologisation, our trans-Atlantic brethren shall not choose to accompany us, we may furnish, after the Ionians, a second example of a colonial dialect improving on its primitive." By referring to pages 417-18, Vol. VII, it will be seen that Mr. Jefferson had remarkably clear and accurate views of the invigorating influence which dialects exert upon a language. In other words, Jefferson, writing about forty years before Max Müller, seemed distinctly to apprehend the process which, in the technical language of modern philosophy, is known as "dialectic regeneration." He expresses himself as follows: "It is much to be wished that the publication of the present county dialects of England should go on. It will restore to us our language in all its shades of variation. It will incorporate into our present one all the riches of our ancient dialects; and what a store this will be may be seen by running the eye over the county glossaries and observing the words we have lost by abandonment and disuse, which in sound and sense are inferior to nothing we have retained. When these local vocabularies are published and digested together with a single one, it is possible we shall find there is not a word in Shakespeare which is not now in use in some of the counties in England, from whence we may obtain its true sense." Mr. Jefferson's views in regard to the relation of Anglo-Saxon to English are probably better known to scholars than his opinions upon the points cited above. He held that Anglo-Saxon was "old English," and that it could be turned into intelligible English by simply divesting it of its antique orthography. He has given us some entertaining illustrations of the mode in which this transformation might be effected. His conception of Anglo-Saxon is in one aspect essentially the same as that

held by the school of Freeman, Morris, and Sweet, in our own time. The process by which he arrives at his conclusions is of course different from that adopted by scientific philology. During the recent visit of Mr. Edward A. Freeman to Baltimore I showed him Mr. Jefferson's Essay on the Anglo-Saxon, which was published by the Board of Trustees for the University of Virginia in 1851. He examined it with great interest, and upon returning it remarked: "Jefferson had the right view. It (Anglo-Saxon) is only old English." He further remarked: "It seems so strange to see Jefferson quoting Bosworth. It is like Washington quoting Stubbs." This little article cannot be regarded as strictly scientific or philological; still, if it induce students of English to seek an intimate acquaintance with Jefferson, it will not be altogether unproductive of good. No diligent reader of his writings can fail to see that he had clear conceptions of dialectic regeneration before philology had become a science, that he understood admirably the function of neology in speech, and that he anticipated the time when the English of the new world might come to be regarded as a dialect of its primitive. Like Mr. Calhoun, he disdained purism, and looked upon language as the minister and not as the mere drapery of thought.

H. E. SHEPHERD.

DEM. 34, 25.

ἔστιν οὖν, ὧς ἄνδρες δικασταί, οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἢ γενήσεται ποτε, ὃς ἀντὶ δισχιλίων καὶ ἑξακοσίων δραχμῶν τριάκοντα μνᾶς καὶ τριακοσίας καὶ ἑξήκοντα ἀποτίνειν προείλετ' ἄν, καὶ τόκον πεντακοσίας δραχμὰς καὶ ἑξήκοντα δανεισάμενος, ὥς φησιν ἀποδεδωκέναι Φορμίων Λάμπιδι, τρισχιλίας ἑννακοσίας εἴκοσιν; [Dindorf. The Zurich ed. reads ἃ φησιν, putting the comma *before* δανεισάμενος]. In § 23 we read: Φορμίων δὲ φησιν ἀποδοῦναι Λάμπιδι ἐν Βοσπόρῳ ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι στατήρας Κυζικηνούς, and it is explained that, at the rate of exchange then current in Bosphorus, this amounted to 3360 dr.; the whole debt due on Phormio's return to Athens being only 2600 dr. The interest on the money, however, which Phormio said he had to borrow at 16 $\frac{2}{3}$  per cent., amounting to 560 dr., makes up the sum which in § 25 is said to have been paid to Lampis. Paley remarks on this: 'It will be observed that the interest (560 dr.) on the sum borrowed in Bosphorus, though really due to the lender, is here unfairly reckoned with the amount paid to Lampis'; and a reference to A. Schaefer is given in confirmation of

this view of the matter. On the other hand Mr. Sandys, the collaborator of Mr. Paley, observes in a subsequent note: 'If Phormio's loan of 1000 dr. from Lampis (§ 5 fin.) was at the same interest as the 2000 dr. from Chrysippus (§ 23 init.) he would owe Lampis exactly 1300 dr. or 13 minae. It is therefore open to Phormio to reply that the alleged overpayment included the sum due to the skipper himself.' This is very ingenious; but is open to the objection (1) that the speaker, who insists so strongly on Phormio's iniquity in having borrowed any additional sums at all (*πρᾶγμα ποιεῖ πάντων δεινότατον*), would certainly not have allowed himself to lump together the debts due to Lampis and to himself; and (2) that we are told expressly in § 40 that these additional loans were paid in Bosphorus out of the produce of the goods sold and not by borrowed money (*τῶν ἐν Βοσπόρῳ πρᾶθέντων τοὺς τὰ ἐτερόπλοια δανείσαντας μόλις διαλύσαντα*), and again in § 26 the payments to these persons are spoken of separately, *τοῖς μὲν τὰ ἐτερόπλοια δανείσασι μόλις τὰρχαῖα ἀποδεδώκας*. The difficulty will be removed if we assume that the words *ἄς φησιν* . . . *Λάμπιδι* have been misplaced, and stood originally immediately after *προεῖλετ' ἄν*, so that the latter part of the passage will read . . . *ἀποτίνειν προεῖλετ' ἄν, ἄς φησιν ἀποδεδωκέναι Φορμίων Λάμπιδι, καὶ τόκον πεντακοσίας δραχμὰς καὶ ἐξήκοντα, δανεισάμενος τρισχιλίας ἐννακοσίας εἴκοσιν*. That is: the speaker asks—can you believe that any man would be so foolish as to pay 3360 dr. instead of 2600 dr. and besides this an interest of 560 dr., having been obliged to borrow this 3920 dr. in order to make the payment? Phormio's asserted loan must have been of the nature of a note discounted. He represented himself to have borrowed the money on some real security (*ἐγγείων τόκων*), and thus accounted for the comparatively low rate of interest (*ἦσαν ἔφεκτοι οἱ ἐγγεῖνοι τόκοι*). Accordingly if Phormio's story was true, instead of discharging a debt of 2600 dr. on his return to Athens, he had chosen to pay 3360 dr. in Bosphorus, and in order to raise the money for this purpose had been compelled to mortgage his real property in Bosphorus to a money-lender for 3920 dr. The speaker may well say *ἔστιν οὖν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἢ γενήσεται ποτε*.

The late M. C. Graux (*Revue de Philologie*, 1878, p. 123) tells us that 'toutes les évaluations stichométriques de l'antiquité sur lesquelles il est actuellement possible d'opérer—donnent régulièrement pour la valeur du stique de 34 à 38 lettres environ, ce qui revient à quinze ou seize syllabes.' The words I suppose to have been misplaced contain 33 letters and 15 syllables, and therefore satisfy sufficiently the above estimate of the amount of a single line.

C. D. MORRIS.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Sammlung Englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben. Erster Band: Ælfrics Grammatik und Glossar, herausgegeben von Julius Zupitza. Erste Abtheilung: Text und Varianten. Zweiter Band: Thomas of Erceldoune, herausgegeben von Alois Brandl. Dritter Band: The Erl of Tolous and the Emperes of Almayn, herausgegeben von Gustav Lüdtké.

Again Prof. Zupitza has agreeably surprised his co-laborers with his unannounced appearance of the Sammlung Englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben. Thus far three volumes have appeared, beginning with Ælfric's Grammatik und Glossar edited by Prof. Zupitza himself. The conception of the undertaking, the selection of the opening volume of what we hope will prove a convenient and at the same time critical library of Anglo-Saxon and Old English, could not have been happier, and augurs good for the undertaking. The well-known ability of the editor and his critical acumen bespeak thoroughness and scholarly care in the preparation of this collection. The need of a convenient and at the same time critical edition of this opening work has long been felt, and Prof. Zupitza deserves hearty thanks for coming forward to meet this want. We not only hope that he may continue the good work thus begun, but also that others may be led thereby to imitate his good example, until all of these now almost inaccessible monuments of the oldest literature of our language shall be rendered accessible to all students. When this shall have been accomplished we may reasonably hope that a complete dictionary of this early period will be undertaken, which in its turn will fill up a gap in this department. It is only to be hoped that Ælfred's Bede may follow close upon Ælfric's Grammar, which as well as the grammar has lain long enough in its now inaccessible form, where none but the fortunate few can occasionally consult it.

The Grammar and Glossary of Ælfric opens a repository of precious and rare forms which have long been concealed from us, and which are of inestimable value in a grammatical point of view. Perhaps no other Anglo-Saxon text affords a like treasure of rare grammatical forms, and this edition will therefore be doubly welcome to all students of Old English.

When we look back to Ælfric's time it is easy to see what motives prompted him to attempt a grammar. It will be remembered that the great Dunstan, born perhaps a little earlier than 925 (see Ten Brink's Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur, p. 128 and following, for a fuller account of this period), had inaugurated that reform among the monks which was to be a reawakening not only of the religious and inner life of the clergy, but also a revival of learning. Æthelwold, Dunstan's great co-laborer and helper, ordained priest on the same day with him, strove to instruct the clergy and through them the people. Called forth by this spiritual renovation which Dunstan and Æthelwold had begun to awaken first among the monks and then among the people, if not by the

direct influence of these two earnest workers for the reform and education of their age, the Blickling Homilies appeared; these were followed about twenty years later by the homilies of Ælfric. Born 959, the latter had imbibed from his youth the purer atmosphere which Æthelwold had diffused, was educated in his school and had fully entered into the ideas of his great master. He was employed in various church matters, but more especially in the composition of pieces of a moral and religious nature, which, like all writings of this kind at the time, were in the Latin language. But the monks, long disused to the Latin tongue and even ignorant of the grammar of their own language, could with difficulty profit by these writings; and it was to meet this need of his age and to lighten the learning of Latin for beginners that Ælfric determined to make an abstract of Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae*, to which he joined an Anglo-Saxon interlinear version. He considered grammar the key which unlocks the meaning of books; and thought it beseeeming in every man endowed with talents to use them for the benefit of his fellow-men, and thus increase the pound entrusted to him in order that he might not be called an unprofitable servant (cf. Preface).

Ælfric found in Priscian well-defined technical expressions for the various grammatical relations, but in the dearth of all grammar in his own tongue he met at the very outset of his undertaking with great difficulty in finding not only appropriate and neat, but also intelligible expressions in Anglo-Saxon, so that it is no matter of surprise to see him groping his way in the dark, or even going astray sometimes. In part, however, he employed the Latin technical terms, giving them an Anglo-Saxon dress, and also made use of others already known. Thus we find of the Latin in English dress: *declinatio*, *declinung*, g. pl. *casa* for *casuum*, d. pl. *casum* for *casibus*. But Ælfric preferred to give the Latin technical expression by an Anglo-Saxon word and then retain the word throughout, as is the case with *cynn* = *genus*, *word* = *verbum*, *tīd* = *tempus*, *getel* = *numerus*, *hād* = *persona*, *nama* = *nomen*, *āgene naman* = *nomina propria*. Oftener, however, he would give the meaning of the Latin expression when it first appeared and retain the Latin term afterwards. Of course it cannot be expected that at that early period in the development of the language, even a man of Ælfric's acknowledged ability would in every instance make a felicitous and apt choice of expressions to translate the Latin technical terms. One is constantly surprised to see what pains he takes to get as literal a translation as possible, even to the sacrificing of the sense, and this desire often led him to make choice of an inappropriate term. Perhaps it will not be altogether without interest to mention a few. Some of the more fortunate are: *grammatica* = *stāfcrāft*, *iunctura litterarum* = *stāfgefēg*, *figura* = *hiw*, *primitiva* = *fyrnyste oððe frumcennede* (not so good), *conjugatio* = *geðeodnys*, *praepositio* = *foresetnys*. Less fortunate are: *primitiva* = *frumcennede*, *relativum* = *ediesendlic*, *relationem* = *edlesunge*, *demonstrativum*, *derivativum* = *ofgangende*, *interjectio* = *betwuxāle-gednys*.

Not often do we find an awkward translation, though Ælfric's wish to be as literal as possible sometimes led him to use awkward expressions. As such we mention his translation of the future passive infinitive by the verbs *faran* and *gangan*, as *vis amatum ire* (probably through carelessness in the transcription for *iri*) = *wylt ðā faran lufjan*; *vis doctum ire* = *wylt ðā gān leornjan*



(p. 134, but p. 151 *wylt ðá gán tæcan*). The supine in *-um* he also translates in the same manner, as *lectum pergit* = *hē gæð rædan*; *bibitum pergo* = *ic gange drincan*. Sometimes his literal translations are misleading, as *twægra ceorla caldor* for *duumvir*, *preðra ceorla caldor* for *triumvir*.

He has offered only a few words on the subject of Etymology, nor could it be expected at this early period. I give one specimen in order to show how this subject was treated at that time: *HOMO mann is gecweden fram HUMO, pæt is fram moldan, forþan ðe seo corðe wæs pæs mannes antimber* (p. 293).

On the whole the defects of the book are not so great as we might have expected. It is not my intention, however, to touch upon all points of interest which the rich material of the book affords, but will simply take up one or two points on the Consonant Declension upon which the forms found here throw some additional light. Of the simple consonant stems we find *bōc* f., *brōc* f., *burg* f., *man* m., and *tang* f. *Bōc* occurs only in the d. sg. *bēc*: *be pisum ðrīm tōddalum wē āwriton on forewerdre pyssere bēc*, p. 290, but from other sources we can complete its declension. King Ælfred furnishes us the g. sg. in two places: *Ælfred Kuning wæs wealhstōd ðisse bēc*, Boet. Prol., and *From pære dura selfre pesse bēc*, Past. C. 24, 11. The form *bōc* occurs in the g. sg. in *seo gefæstnunge pyssere landbōc*, Dipl. Angl. 318 (Knut MXXIII), and in the d. sg. we find *bōc* also only a few years later. But these forms are of no value whatever. The real form of the g. sg. ought to be *bōce*, which is never found (cf. Amer. Journ. of Phil. II 195. Scherer's form *bōce* ZGDS<sup>1</sup> 436 is therefore a mistake). G. sg. *bēc* can only be explained as borrowed from the d. sg. unless we accept the shorter ending *-jas* of the genitive singular in this word, which is not probable on account of the forms *burge*, *gōse*, etc., which the other stems commonly have. The form of the n. ac. pl. *brēc* = *femoralia*, *wæðbrēc* = *perizonata campestris* (p. 315), adds nothing new, as this form occurs often. The g. and d. sg. have not yet been found. Ælfric furnishes another proof that the g. sg. of these stems ends in *e* and does not umlaut. We have already (*l. c.*) considered the g. sg. *byrig* as a poetical form taken from the d. sg., because in Ælfred's writings we find only the form *burge*. Ælfric confirms this, as he has p. 29 *hæc Tirus anre burge nama*. Twice we find the d. sg. *burig*, p. 273, 280, which is the regular form expected here. From other sources we have besides this form the forms *burh* and *burge*, on *pære burh*. Blickl. Hom. 197, on *pære burh naht gewinnan*. Lye. Suppl. Sermo. innan *pære burh*. ib. The Durham Ritual has generally the regular form, but once we find the surprising form in *ðæm byrig*, p. 196; *ad arcem et ad maenia, tō burge and wealle*, Kent. Gl. in Zs. f. d. a. 21, 24; *pe he bigge oðer sylle āðer oððe burge oððe on wæpengetæce*, AS. Laws ed. by Schmidt, 2. Aufl. 195. The form *burh* may be explained as a case where the vowel *i* has fallen out behind a guttural (cf. this Journ. II 198 ff.) *Burge* will probably have to be explained by the third method of forming the dative singular as explained in this Journal II, pp. 47, 48, 49. *Man* offers the d. sg. *alcum men*, p. 27, and *pæt sumum men stent ege fram mē*, p. 123. The word *tang* = *forceps*, p. 67, only occurs in the n. sg. Ettm. Wb. 526 gives *tange tangan*, Cot. 81, which would make our word an *n*-stem. The O. N. n. pl. *tengr tangir* indicates an *i*-stem, with which the O. H. G. d. sg. *zangi* coincides.

Of the nouns of relationship only two occur: *brōðor* and *fæder*, in cases which have an interest for us; of these *brōðor* has in the g. sg. *brōðor*, *āres brōðor* =

*nostri fratris*, d. sg. *brēðer*, *ārum brēðer* = *nostro fratri*, *fram ārum brēðer* = *a nostro fratre*, and the n. pl. *āre (ge)brōðra* = *nostri fratres*, p. 102: *fæder* is found in the d. sg. in *ic geefenlace minum fæder* = *patrisso*, p. 215, and *after bebyrgedum fæder*, p. 275. No new forms are offered here, but we see no transition into the *a*-declension, as is often the case with *fæder* in other authors.

Of the present participles we find the ac. pl. *fýnd*: *a se expellunt hostes* = *hī ādrafað heora find him fram*, p. 110. *Arcesso* = *ic āflīge mīne fýnd* *ōððe genyrwige*, p. 166. In the d. sg. we find the form *fýnd*: *adversum inimicum pergit* = *tōgeānes his fýnd hē gāð*, unless this be the ac. pl. also. But the following examples tend to show that *tōgeānes* governs the dative in this sense: *farað him tōgeānes*, Sal. 119; *eodon him tōgeānes*, An. 45, 657; *hē him tō geānes rād*, B. 1893. Ettmüller Wb. 423, quotes *tōgeānes his frýnd*, Gen. 14, 17, and our passage as examples of *tōgeānes* governing the ac. Not having the text at hand it is impossible to say whether in the passage cited from Gen. we have the sing. or plur. and therefore we can come to no conclusion in regard to this passage<sup>1</sup>; in the d. sg. in other places we often have this unlauded form, e. g. *and gān tō his frýnd*, Ælf. Hom. I 248, and *pāt pā pīnum frýnd ne helpe*, Deut. 15, 10, which show that this form in the dative was known and used even by Ælfric. In O. H. G. we also find *friunt* in the d. sg. (Ahd. Gl. herausgeg. von Steinmeyer and Sievers, p. 705, 65), instead of the more usual form *friunti*. It is evident that at one time this unlauded form was the prevalent one, which had partially replaced the flexionless form, and was in its place replaced by the form of the *a*-declension. And as we have seen in this Journ. vol. II, 191, that Ælfric and Ælfred always employed the unlauded plurals *fýnd*, *frýnd*, to which we can now add the datives singular *fýnd*, *frýnd*, we may indeed assume the unlauded forms to have been the best authorized ones at one time. That the ununlauded forms were the earlier and more correct, *i. e.* the correct reflex of the Gothic *frijands*, *frijōnds*, and that the unlauded forms *fýnd*, *frýnd* are the result of a transition into the *i*-declension, has already been shown in the article above cited.

In the other declensions we find nothing new and can therefore condense our remarks on this head. The word *might* occurs in the g. sg., *lufigendlicere mihte* = *amandae virtutis*, p. 152. Sievers, P. B. B. I 495, in his article entitled *Kleine Beiträge zur Deutschen Grammatik*, formulates the rule that "all *i*-stems have the umlaut throughout, have no ending in the n. and ac. sg., and have in the g. pl. only *a*," and p. 499 he further says: "For the older A. S. therefore there is only one clearly-defined distinction between the *ā*- and *i*-stems, viz. in the ac. sg. (*ā*-stems have -e), and not until later did this difference disappear." In his enumeration of those words which have not assumed the form of the *ā*-stems in the ac. sg. we find p. 497 ac. sg. *meaht miht*, and for the older period this was probably the only form. Later, however, we find constantly the form *meahte mihte* in the ac. sg., unless we agree with Sievers in saying that possibly the pl. of these abstract nouns is often used for the singular, which may be true and for which many examples can be produced in proof. And yet when we place the examples of both forms *miht*, *mihte* side by side we are almost led to believe that *mihte* is an ac. sg. and not an ac. pl. We give here a few of the many examples we have found in various authors: *ðurh mihte* (twice) *ðæs halgan gastes*,

<sup>1</sup> Through the kindness of Prof. Child I learn that Ettmüller's quotation is false, as no passage of the kind occurs in Gen.

Ælfred's Beda 445; *Gif ðre godas ænige mihle hæfdon*, ib. 141; and *heo hæfað þas mighte*, Leechd. I 290; *ðurh Godes mihle*, ib. III 424; *þurh his þa mycclan miht*, Blickl. Hom. 17, 33. The form *miht*, *meht* is the predominant one here: *æteorwan his mihle and willan* (ac. pl.) ib. 67; *ðurh miht ðres drihtnes*, *ðurh þæs lifigendan Godes miht he bið ofslagen* and *na ðurh nanes engles mihle*, Lye. Suppl. Sermo; *Cneoris and Cneoris hergað werc ðin and maht þine*, St. Ps. 162, 3. But often *mæhte* also with no perceptible difference of meaning. We also find the plural *mihla*, which in its turn indicates a transition into the *ā*-declension. We have already in this Journal II 198 alluded to the fact that the *d*. sg. often appears in the flexionless form *miht*, which is likewise the case in O. H. G., and explained this fact as the dropping of the vowel *i* behind dentals.

II. Thomas of Erceldoune, edited by Alois Brandl, is a poem containing the so-called prophecies of Thomas of Erceldoune. Its historical worth, though not to be entirely discarded by the historian, is of minor importance on account of its inaccuracies. Its chief merit lies therefore in its philological interest in respect of its dialect, and from the fact that the time of its composition can be quite definitely determined by the frequent allusions to contemporary events. The editor has known how to make good use of these, and the discussions of various points of interest relating to the author, time of composition and political allusions will be welcome to all. Great care is shown in the preparation of the work for the press, and it will be found a convenient book of reference for those studying this period.

III. The Erl of Tolous and the Emperes of Almayn: eine Englische Romanze aus dem Anfange des 15 Jahrhunderts nebst litterarischer Untersuchung über ihre Quelle, die ihr verwandten Darstellungen und ihre geschichtliche Grundlage, herausgegeben von Gustav Lüdtké. The present is the first critical edition of this work and an attempt to rescue the English metrical romances from the oblivion in which they have lain so long. Many of these may have no great aesthetical worth, and may therefore not afford very enjoyable reading, but from a historical and philological point of view they throw great light upon the customs and manners of the English people of the middle ages, as also upon their language. Hence the student of history and philology will heartily greet the appearance of this critical edition of a really interesting and enjoyable little poem aside from its historical and philological worth. That time and pains have not been spared to make it in every way acceptable is vouched for by its admission into this series. The introduction contains all that could be wished for a thorough study of the sources, its treatment in different lands, and its historical foundations.

In conclusion we can only hope that the good work thus prosperously inaugurated may go on until this whole field has been explored and all works of worth given to us in handy and critical editions.

S. P.

Faust, von Goethe. Mit Einleitung u. fortlaufender Erklärung, herausgegeben von K. I. SCHRÖER. Heilbronn: Henninger. Erster Theil (1881), pp. lxxxvi, 303; Zweiter Theil (1881), pp. cii, 442.

It would be damning Schröer's work with faint praise to call it the *best* edition of *Faust*. It is the *only* edition that aims at explaining the poem from beginning to end in a spirit of scholarly accuracy and generous fulness. Within the narrow limits of this notice I cannot attempt to do justice to Schröer's labors; I can only call attention to them, and proffer one or two criticisms of a general nature.

The mere fulness of the running commentary (printed at the bottom of the text page) is as gratifying as it is surprising. The editor is justified—from his point of view—in boasting, p. v of the Preface to the First Part, *dass keiner Schwierigkeit ausgewichen ist*. From his point of view, I say. Having made daily use of the commentary for months, I can testify most cheerfully to his honesty in not "dodging," as we say, a knotty point. But has he *detected* every lurking difficulty? Most emphatically not. Even in the First Part, which is in the main comparatively easy, there are several passages which call for more light. *E. g.* in speaking of the scene in Auerbach's Cellar, p. 121, Schröer says: The company consists of students of the roughest (*rohest*) sort. This is the traditional view. But is it correct? To me, Frosch, Brander, etc., are not students at all, but Philistines. They have not a trace of student-nature, neither in their notions nor in their deportment. Besides, every editor seems to have overlooked the circumstance that Faust has formally turned his back upon university life; the very last words that Mephistopheles pronounces in the scene immediately preceding this one are: I congratulate you upon your *new* career. Surely Goethe would not start Faust on his new career by introducing him to a student-carouse! There is still too much of the conventional in Goethe-criticism. In the Second Part the difficulties multiply. Goethe has taxed the resources of the language to their utmost; every page abounds in delicate shades of meaning, in allusions hinted rather than expressed, and in *Gedankensprünge*. For most of these Schröer has a satisfactory, or at least a plausible interpretation. But not a few of them have wholly escaped his observation, he is not even aware of their existence. How may we account for this? The following explanation suggests itself. The Second Part is not studied, *i. e.* read and interpreted, line by line, as the First Part is. Those who take it up at all read it rapidly and with an eye to the general effect. Undoubtedly Schröer, no less than Düntzer, v. Loeper, and a few other scholars, has read and interpreted to *himself* every line of the Second Part. But has he interpreted every line to some young pupil quick to feel the least break in thought or in syntax and satisfied only with a direct explanation? This is work of a very different order; it is a test that sifts one's knowledge most pitilessly. I write from experience on the point, for I am now engaged in translating and analysing the Second Part with a special pupil who has selected the *Faust* for a graduation-thesis, and I know better than ever before what it means to interpret Goethe. Were Schröer to listen to some of these class-room discussions, he would be surprised to see how much he has taken for granted. In truth, until the entire *Faust* has been used as a text-book by at least one generation of select classes, we may be permitted to doubt our getting a perfectly adequate

commentary. Yet, despite an occasional shortcoming, Schröder's commentary is a storehouse of valuable material, arranged in admirable shape. The briefest inspection will satisfy every one that it is the result of years of patient labor. It only remains to add in this connection that each Part has an alphabetical index to the notes and literary references; this index serves the purpose of a partial concordance. The verse-numbering is too complicated. Schröder has attempted in the First Part to preserve v. Loeper's numbering uncorrected, also corrected by five lines, and his own numbering. In the Second Part we have one continuous count including the First Part, another continuous count beginning with the Second Part, and a third count separate for each Act. It seems to me that there is but one way of numbering, viz. to regard the poem, both Parts, as a whole, and to count from beginning to end. The total is only 12,110; considerably less than Wace's *Brut*, 15,300, or Layamon 16,120 (full lines). It is surprising that advocates of the "unity" of *Faust*, like Schröder and v. Loeper, should forego the use of so helpful an ally as continuous numbering.

The present is no place for discussing Schröder's position in the great *Faust* question. Enough to say that he is a firm believer in the "unity" of the poem; to him the Second Part is no mere after-thought, the capricious expression of declining powers, but rather the mature and well-weighed fulfilment of a purpose, and even of a plan, which Goethe had formed in his youth and which he never lost sight of. There can be no doubt but that this opinion is now in the ascendancy, and will eventually prevail to the exclusion of all others. Again, Schröder is no friend of the so-called "aesthetic" school. He is not willing to let Goethe be judged by the conventional standards of critics like Vischer, who are bent upon forcing the facts of art into their theories. A great genius like Goethe is not to be gauged and valued by what we think he ought to have said. If he has anything to say, we can well afford to listen, no matter whether we can make it fit into our *Schablone* or not. And to understand Goethe there is only one way: to discover the concrete situation, the *Bild* from which he started. For Goethe is not the poet who embodies abstract thoughts, but the poet whose thoughts evolve themselves from the situations supplied by his actual experience or the images created by his imagination.

Among the novelties brought forward by Schröder these two are the most striking: first, the direct connection of the first appearance of Mephistopheles at the emperor's court and the conjuration of Helena with two poems by Hans Sachs. This discovery may eventually lead to others in the growth of the *Faust* legend, and possibly throw some light on the sources of Marlowe's *Faustus*. The other is the hint thrown out, p. xxvi of the Introduction to the Second Part, that it was not Goethe's original intention to make two parts of the poem, that the appearance of Helena was included in his first plan, but that she was thrust into the background by Gretchen. Schröder's words, rather freely rendered, run thus: "It seems to me that there are still evident traces in the First Part of Helena's being supplanted by Gretchen. The mood (*Stimmung*) of the young Goethe, that mood which originated Goetz v. Berlichingen and Egmont's Clärchen, will explain to us how his interest in the classic heroine was of necessity abated by the more human interest he felt in the charm of Gretchen's simplicity. Mephistopheles was to show Helena to Faust in the magic mirror, and to intensify his longing for her by means of the



magic potion, and this is still discernible in the scene in the Witch's Kitchen, written much later than the first inception (written at Rome in 1788). But Faust is not seized with longing for Helena. He sees Gretchen, and Helena is forgotten. He is magnetically attracted by all that is charming in the innocence and naïveté of German womanhood. And he, that is the poet, cannot shake off this spell. The deep passion, the hearty love of Faust and Gretchen must run its course—her bliss, her fall, her guilt, her ruin. By the side of all this there is no room for Helena. The Gretchen-tragedy was no premeditated plan, it carried the poet along irresistibly, and became an independent story by itself. Hence the necessity of a Second Part, the original object of the Faust-drama being still unattained."

Such an observation can be made only by one who has studied the poem long and lovingly. At first startling, it commends itself more and more the oftener it is pondered. It adjusts the two parts of the poem better than has been possible hitherto, and it is in keeping with all that we know of Goethe's life and manner of composition.

J. M. HART.

---

De Euripideorum Prologorum Arte et Interpolatione. Scr. J. KLINKENBERG. Bonn, 1881.

This little book, which has received one of the annual prizes of the University of Bonn, deserves to be studied with the same patience and candor with which it has been written. When the history of modern philological research comes to be written, Euripidean study in the last six score years will come in for an interesting chapter. A good deal has been learned since Samuel Musgrave had his *Exercitationes in Euripidem* printed at Leyden; and very simple-minded do some of the enthusiastic young physician's observations seem to us now. The greatest gains have been made, of course, in the line of more rigorous analysis of the language and better sifting of the diplomatic material; but these are not the only gains. That Euripides as well as other ancient authors had suffered from the defiling hands of interpolators had been known for centuries, but it was Valckenaer who first felt the duty of paying conscientious heed to this fact in editing the text, who first wrote, clearly and sharply: *nam hos ne audiendos quidem arbitror, nedum refutandos, qui dura quævis atque absurda quidquam esse causæ negabunt cur non imputarentur Euripidi*. A very long step toward a just appreciation of the value of the received texts was taken when Boeckh's discussion of the famous law of Lycurgus made it seem most probable that for more than two thousand years the standard editions of all the Greek tragic poets have been but copies of stage-copies. Since then scholars have had more and more in mind the many curious facts which the old commentators have left us about the ways of antique theatrical companies in dealing with their lines; and it is now hardly open to any one, however much inclined to do so, to be ignorant of or ignore the external evidence that the plays of Euripides, especially, have suffered considerable interpolations. And few men who have at their command the necessary sympathy with Euripides and his art, and read his existing plays reflectively, say three or four times through, will be disposed to question the importance of this external evidence. The

number of passages is serious in which *something* has defeated a purpose conceived so clearly and mastered so entirely by the poet that we cannot rationally ascribe the failure to feeble or vacillating vision on his part. The statement of Klinkenberg, apropos of quoted passages: *de locis Euripideis ab aliis scriptoribus prolatis hoc minime neglegendum est omnes praeter ipsius Euripidis aequales legisse fabulas eius interpolatas*,—may fairly be regarded now as a commonplace of Euripidean criticism. In regard to another of Klinkenberg's statements of doctrine: *nam si versus quidam cum aliis eiusdem fabulae locis aperte pugnant aut cum illius quae loquitur personae ingenio sive cum totius fabulae argumento non consentiunt aut nexum sententiarum intolerabili modo interrumpunt, eos ab Euripide, si quidem sanus fuit poeta, profectos esse non posse nemo negabit*,—it may be necessary among English-speaking philologists to qualify somewhat the universality of the *nemo*, for the Horatian *Durum sed levius fit patientia quidquid corrigere est nefas* is an exceedingly convenient maxim; but probably the *nemo* is true enough so far as persons are concerned who have studied the plays as much as Klinkenberg has.

Distinct advances in the detection and classification of interpolations have been made especially by Cobet, Nauck, Hirzel, Wilamowitz, advances which may fairly lead us to believe that a tolerably complete separation of the wheat from the chaff will some day be effected, a tolerably precise theory of the motives and methods of interpolation will some day be stated and universally accepted. Of these writers Hirzel was the first to call attention distinctly to the impregnable thesis, that, if the text of Euripides is interpolated, we can form no just or rational notion of his art until we have decided, at least in the main, what the interpolated portions are. But although Hirzel was an acute and persuasive critic, and although his pamphlet (*De Eur. in componendis diverbiis arte*, Bonn, 1862) is of permanent value, he was much under the influence of his theory of elaborate responsion in the dialogue of Euripides, and so attacked his problem from the wrong end. But preconceived opinions have not been the only misleading influence. The fear of critics "*die in der Jagd auf Interpolationen eine Modekrankheit der zeitgenössischen Philologie sehen*" has doubtless done something to deter timid scholars from stating the question in the way which the peculiar facts of the tradition of the text of Euripides render imperative. Even Nauck, the first of living authorities in this field, almost apologizes (*Eur. Stud.*, II 22) for having detected three spurious verses together. But it is no part of a reviewer's duty to write a polemic.

Klinkenberg seeks to discover what plan Euripides followed in producing his prologues. Critics who believe that a poet like Euripides worked without plan, scholars who believe it possible to appreciate a poet's work without divining his plan, will naturally have little interest in the subject. But those who think a solid result, if gained by such an investigation, might be worth the trouble it cost, will agree with Klinkenberg that nothing can be done until the investigator is ready to pronounce judgment on the genuineness of each and every verse of the prologues. Scholars who hold that no such judgment can ever be pronounced, must also hold that any examination of the poet's art is wholly futile. Klinkenberg begins, then, by examining the genuineness of the prologues line by line, word by word, with an astonishing diligence and a very high degree of grammatical sobriety. It would be useless here to give a list of

his conclusions—they can really only have a value for those who read the discussions. It is of course impossible to examine the prologues without treating occasionally other portions of the plays, and the reader will find more than one valuable excursus. Of these the most striking is the settlement of the question where the scene of the Heraclidae is laid. The proof is complete that Euripides laid the scene at Athens. Evidently then the passage containing v. 32 has been seriously tampered with. The prologue of the Supplices is the only one in which Klinkenberg finds no interpolations. The extraordinary difficulties of the Ion and the Bacchae are adequately treated, but it would be too much to say that they are made to disappear entirely. But readers of the Journal will be more grateful for a statement of Klinkenberg's results than for discussion of single passages. I quote his words: "Prologi Euripidei omnia ea continent quae spectatoribus ad ipsius dramatis actionem intellegendam scitu necessaria sunt: scaenam dramatis explicant et personarum gravissimarum fata, quantum quidem ad ipsam fabulam pertinent, usque ad illud temporis momentum enarrant, quo fabulae ipsius actio incipit."

"Prologos Euripides hoc consilio scripsit, ut spectatores ea quae dixi non per unam aut complures fabulae scaenas sparsa, sed perpetua oratione secundum rerum ordinem enarrata accurate cognoscerent et memoria tenerent." So far all sounds familiar. But let us see the precise application of the doctrine.

"Omnes prologi Euripidei tripartiti sunt."

"Exordium prologi praeparat historias in media parte enarrandas."

"Semper fere persona *προλογίζουσα*, ut quam celerrime a spectatoribus cognoscatur, plerumque in exordio, certe inter prima narrationis verba nomen suum expresse dicit; si non dicit, alio modo curavit poeta, ut spectatores quemnam in scaena viderent statim in exordio intellegerent."

"Quam celerrime fieri potest, locus actionis fabulae indicatur notaturque pronomine *ὁδε*. Eodem cum vocabulo coniunguntur omnes res et personae quas spectatores in scaena conspiciunt; quas non conspiciunt eae illud pronomen respuunt." [Accordingly Med. 39, Hip. p. 48, And. p. 38, I. A. 72, are spurious.]

"Media prologi pars, . . . gravissima est: eas res spectatoribus enarrat, quibus fabulae actio nititur. Si totum drama unum est, unam complectitur historiam, si duo capita habet, duas historias praebet." [Compare Medea with Hippolytus.]

"Media prologi pars rerum narrationem usque ad illud temporis momentum producit, quo fabulae ipsius actio incipit; nunquam ea quae spectatores postea suis oculis videbunt, enarrat iisque voluptatem spectandae fabulae praeripit." [The apparent exception in the Hecuba is so clearly explained as to afford proof of the rule. "Nunquam Euripides in prologis fabulae ipsius argumentum praedixit; si qua delibare debebat, tam tecte et caute fecit, ut nihilominus spectatores in fabula ipsa prorsus nova viderent. Quam egregie haec quadrant in poetam *τραγικώτατον*!"]

"Prologi narratio nunquam interrumpitur rebus alienis." "Quam ob rem Euripides in prologorum corpore a dictis, quibus aliis tragoediarum locis abundat, prorsus abstinuit." Especially noteworthy are the condemned passages in the Hippolytus (7, 8) and Medea (14, 15).

"Prologi conclusio ad personam *προλογίζουσαν* pertinet; aut facta aut cogitationes eius continet. Interdum ea persona indicatur, quae post prologum recitatum in scaenam prodit demonstraturque spectatoribus pronomine *ὁδε*; nunquam autem eam personam *προλογίζουσα* alloquitur."

"Ii prologi qui optime cum ipsa fabula coeunt, omnes sunt prioris aetatis poeseos Euripideae. Posteriore tempore poeta non solum nexum internum magis magisque solvit, sed etiam externo illo vinculo, ut persona *προλογίζουσα* insequentem personam indicaret, non iam usus est."

"Duo genera interpolationis grassata sunt in prologis Euripideis: alterum quod grammaticum voco, alterum histrionale."

"Ad prius genus omnes eas refero interpolationes, quae verborum poetae interpretandorum causa additae sunt."

"Histriones duplici modo prologis Euripideis nocuerunt: additamenta intrusere aut ad scaenam fabulae immutandam aut ad *πάθος* sermonis augendum."

To the reviewer these principles all appear well established. If one more than another may be regarded as beyond the reach of doubt, it is the sharp rule regarding the use of *ὁδε*. And however unwilling the reader may be to accept so favorable a judgment, no one can read Klinkenberg's pages, so laborious and so luminous, without getting some stimulus from the conscientious and enthusiastic spirit of his work. The style is simple, clear, correct, and never dull.

J. H. WHEELER.

---

The New Phrynichus, being a revised text of the Ecloga of the grammarian Phrynichus, with Introductions and Commentary by W. GUNION RUTHERFORD, M. A., of Balliol College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

Rutherford's Phrynichus is a decided contrast to Lobeck's Phrynichus in every point, from the redundant style to the sumptuous dress, which one is almost tempted to call a *καλὸν ἐντάφιον*. Mr. Rutherford is a great admirer of the Dutch school, but his zeal is not always according to knowledge, and it remains to be seen what Cobet will think of his disciple. Dutch scholars are somewhat prone to declamatory depreciation of non-Batavian philologists, and Cobet's writings are full of sarcasm and diatribe, but there is a kind of convention among grammarians that the style shall not be wildly enthusiastic nor even oratorically fervid. If the ordinary tone is forsaken, the only variety that is considered tolerable is the subacid or the subacid, of which examples enough can be found in the works of "Augustus Lobeck," with which Mr. Rutherford professes himself to have been long familiar. So opening Lobeck's Phrynichus quite at random, one finds, p. 15: Taedet me recentiorum scriptorum inconstantiam ante oculos exponere, quam si satis considerasset Schweighauserus, nunquam spem illam temerariam, quam in praefat. ad Appian. p. 112, ostendit, restituenduae aequalitatis, animo concepisset, neque per magnam libri partem miserum illud sigma vi et furca expulisset. P. 270. Hic omnes fideculas intendunt Abreschius et Sallierius. But even these *lumina orationis* were better away, because they foster a malignant habit, and grammarians are a crabbed race at best. Still there are worse things than malignity and crab-

bedness in a grammarian as a grammarian, and among these worse things must be classed profuse rhetoric in a subject which demands brief, sharp, lucid exposition. Mr. Rutherford desires to defend certain themes which are not startlingly new. So for instance he lays great stress on the Ionism of the tragic poets and on the untrustworthiness of Xenophon; and the wealth of rhetoric with which he enforces his themes is stupendous. Every new phenomenon calls for a new outburst. 'Even the stones cry out against regarding the peculiarly tragic forms of words as due to no more than a craving for elevation of style.' 'The large mantle which for centuries formed the outer covering of Greeks, and admitted of so many graceful adjustments, was in the Homeric age designated as *φᾶρος*, but in Attic invariably *ἱμάτιον*.' After stating the use of *ὑδρία* he says: 'There could not be a more striking instance of the vigor, thoroughness and rapidity with which the people of Attica recast their old language, and replaced worn and stiff terms by crisp and flexible innovations.' One stops and asks 'For whom is the New Phrynichus written?' Certainly school-boys would not care to read it, and maturer men can draw their own conclusions. Scholars do not need to be told 'that the phenomena of language presented by Greece up to the time of Alexander were exceptional to a degree,' and are not likely to brook the oracular tone in which Mr. Rutherford announces 'that it is contrary to all reason to treat Xenophon as a genuine Attic writer.' One or two specimens of this peculiar style of enlivening grammatical disquisitions will suffice to complete this anthology. After stating the rule, 'All verbs expressing the exercise of the senses or denoting any functional state or process have the inflexions of the middle voice, either throughout or in the future tense,' he goes on to remark: 'No inquiry (what inquiry?) is more rich in side results, and the history of this law is the history of the Attic dialect. The importance of the generalization cannot be overrated. It restores to the Athenian language the precision and symmetry which were peculiarly its own, and brings out its grand and simple outlines. It supplies rules for textual criticism, it sheds a new light upon the import of many words, and is of incalculable service in tracing the development of Attic speech.' This is fervid and copious, and we long for a further revelation. But the oracle is mute just at the most interesting moment, and as if the enthusiasm had evaporated Mr. Rutherford tells us that the reason for the employment of the middle voice in the future while the active is used in the present, 'it is useless to discuss, as it is impossible to discover' (p. 381). This is coldly cruel, after raising our hopes so high in p. 138. It is perhaps not altogether unknown to those who have exercised the useful but not exhilarating function of teaching the Greek irregular verb, that *τίπτω* in many of its forms is theoretical and un-Attic. It is this very consideration that dislodged the venerable *εἰδωλον* from its throne of honor in the paradigms and put in its stead, now *λείπω* (Thiersch, 1812), now *λέω*, now *βουλεύω*. Veitch's Greek Verbs, Irregular and Defective, is a constant companion of all teachers who value the quality of their work, and to the owners of Veitch the eccentricities of *τίπτω* are no secret. And yet when Mr. Rutherford is about to write his pages on *τίπτω* he seems overwhelmed with his own audacity, and breaks forth in this deprecatory strain: 'It is almost reprehensible to destroy such a time-honored structure and root up so many fond associations, and it will readily be believed that the follow-



ing pages were penned in a turbulence of spirit almost equal to Luther's when he nailed his articles on the church-door at Wittenberg.' Mr. Rutherford can hardly be in a position to make free use of German literature, judging by the extraordinary jumble which he has made of a quotation from Tycho Mommsen (pp. 415, 416), but surely he ought to know what is going on in his own neighborhood, and a man so well acquainted with Mr. Verrall's plastic emendations should not be oblivious of Mr. Sandys' edition of Demosthenes, in which there is an excursus on *τύπτω* appended to the *contra Cononem* (LIV)<sup>1</sup>. But enough of Mr. Rutherford's eloquence. If he had rigidly cut out all his fine writing he might have done good service, although his ignorance of the elementary rules of Greek accentuation would exclude his book from any consideration whatever, had it not been written in England, where we no longer expect the mechanical accuracy of the older generation. Greek accent could have meant nothing to Porson, and yet he was careful about it. It means nothing to most Englishmen of our day, and many of their good scholars are lamentably negligent in this regard. Only Mr. Rutherford abuses our patience, and on one page (p. 99) accentuates nine perfect infinitives wrong, besides sprinkling false accents freely throughout the book. One point more. In a long discussion of *ἐρχομαι* and that group, Mr. Rutherford takes Professor Goodwin to task for giving a future sense to the moods of *εἶμι*. Mr. Rutherford is a great admirer of our American Hellenist, so great an admirer that he quotes in his preface a passage from Professor Goodwin, in which Professor Goodwin is only echoing Madvig, so that Mr. Rutherford's strictures on what he calls a 'book of rare merit' have no unkindliness in them. But while it is true that Professor Goodwin's phraseology is unguarded, Mr. Rutherford is himself in error when he denies a future sense to the moods of *εἶμι*. Infinitive, optative and participle of *εἶμι* may all be future in *oratio obliqua*, of which alone Professor Goodwin was thinking. Veitch is doubtless right in saying that the future sense is less common—and he might have said much less common—but there is no denying the future sense in *ὑπεξίεναι*, Plat. Phaidon p. 103 D, coupled with *ἀπολείσθαι*; of *ἐξίονεν* in Xen. Hell. 5, 1, 34; of *ιόντες* in Thuk. 5, 7—all familiar examples. What were the Attics to use? *ἐλευσοίμην*, *ἐλεύσεσθαι*, *ἐλευσόμενος*? Mr. Rutherford cannot produce one Attic *ἐλευσοίμην*, and for *ἐλεύσεσθαι* he has recourse to the much emended passage in Lysias 22, 13, where he credits Rauch (!)—read Rauchenstein—with *οὐ καταφύξεσθαι*, Scheibe with *οὐκέτι φεύξεσθαι* and Cobet with *οὐ τρέψεσθαι*, adding 'there may be other corrections equally futile.' Some months ago when pondering this passage, what seems to me an evident emendation came into my mind, suggested doubtless by my recent reading in Dionysios (p. 1001), *πορεύσεσθαι*. On turning from my old Bekker text to Frohberger I found that I had been anticipated and the reading substantiated by parallel passages. In view of the coincidence it is natural that I should not consider that emendation futile. Mr. Rutherford has done so much hard work that it is a pity he had not submitted his style to the pruning knife and more carefully tested his results.

B. L. G.

<sup>1</sup> By the way, Mr. Sandys corrects Veitch for quoting as from Lysias a passage of Theon's, and himself deserves to be quoted for quoting a passage as Theon's which does not belong to Theon at all, as he might have found out, if he had not been in too great a hurry to catch the estimable Veitch tripping.

Die Lateinische Partikel *Ut*. Eine von der Norwegischen Universität mit der goldenen Medaille des Kronprinzen belohnte Preisschrift von BASTIAN DAHL. Kristiania, 1882. pp. 304.

This prize essay, which the author has made more accessible to the world of scholars by publishing it in German, is deserving of wide recognition as the most thorough and comprehensive treatise yet written on this many-sided particle. The author has gone conscientiously to work and collected his own materials, which for the early period may be said to be quite exhaustive, while numerous examples have been gathered from Vergil, Caesar, Sallust, Cicero, Ovid, Horace, Livy, Tacitus, Suetonius and later writers. The more important modern works which bear upon the field of investigation have not escaped the author's notice. While there is no painful straining after striking originality of view, the method of treatment is fresh, and gives evidence of a calm, independent judgment, and a disposition to weigh the facts and to grapple honestly with the difficulties which the conditions of each new problem present. If the results are not as surprising as *e. g.* those reached by Lübbert in his work on *quom*, it is due to the fact that the prevailing usages of *ut* were earlier fixed.

The treatise begins properly with a discussion of the form and etymology of *ut*. *Utei* is shown to prevail in the earliest period, there being 106 instances of its use in the first volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum as against 11 of *uti* and 10 of *ut*. In Plautus, however, the relation of *uti* : *ut* is about 100 : 1500, while Horace uses *ut* 350 times and *uti* only 21 times. The original form *quotei* is resolved into a root *quo* = Skt.  $\sqrt{ka}$ , and the locative of a demonstrative  $\sqrt{ta}$ . The Umbrian furnishes as parallel forms *pusei*, *pusi*, *puse*, the Oscan *pus*. Of locative force but few traces have been preserved; the predominating sense is modal. The various uses of *ut* are then treated under the following grand divisions: I. *Ut* interrogativum. II. *Ut* relativum. III. *Ut* temporale. IV. *Ut* consecutivum. V. *Ut* finale. VI. Gegenstandsätze mit coniunctivus generis. VII. Gegenstandsätze mit coniunctivus finalis. VIII. Elliptische *ut* sätze. The interrogative use is shown to be quite common in the archaic, but limited in the classical period. The transition is easily made to the exclamatory use, of which numerous examples are given. In treating of indirect questions Dahl follows Becker, and very properly takes issue with Fuhrmann, who conceives *viden ut* and *audin ut* to have analogy with *nescio quis*. It is to be regretted here that more light is not shed upon the development of the idiom *satin ut*. The relative *ut* receives attention under various heads. It is interesting to observe that in objective comparisons the early period is more circumstantial in repeating the predicate. Capt. 369, *Servitum fers ita, ut ferri decet*. Noteworthy too is the archaic use of a relative clause after *verba declarandi vel sentiendi* where classical usage leads us to expect an indirect question. Amp. 1129, *Hanc rem, ut factast, eloquar*. 33 such examples are given, drawn mostly from Plautus and Terence. Here the modal force is seen in full strength, while in subjective comparisons it is often obscured. Where the comparison partakes of metaphor *sic* is more common than *ita* in the main clause. The use of *ut* as concessive-adversative seems not to antedate Cicero and is especially frequent in writers under the empire. Of *ut* iurativum, as Dr. Dahl felicitously terms it, after *ita* the comic poets furnish us a wealth of examples which deserve to be studied. How bitter is the irony in

Aul. 754, *ita te amabit Iuppiter ut tu nescis!* Certain parenthetical expressions like *ut mos est* show wide range of use, of others the rise may be pointed out. *Ut fit* which is so common in Livy occurs already six times in Terence, but not once in Plautus if we except Capt. Prol. v. 24, where perhaps it may go to swell the evidence of post-Plautine revision. Under *ut* affirmativum cases are treated where a parenthetical *ut* clause affirms a statement to be true which in the main clause is merely assumed. Cic. fin. 5, 51, *Si virtus digna est gloria, ut est.* On this use Anton, Studien zur Lat. Grammatik, Part II, is more full and instructive. No examples are cited from early Latin and the idiom is one more likely to occur in prose. On the other hand the comic poets use *ut* as a causal particle where the later language would prefer *quod* or *cum*. Truc. II, 7, 22, *Pallidast ut peperit puerum.* It must be remembered, however, that Plautus could not have used *quod* here in causal sense. In discussing the temporal use of *ut* perhaps the author is too ready to admit that *ut* here lays aside its modal force or that this is wholly absorbed in the temporal function, just as *ubi* unites both time and space relations. The transition in any event must have been a gradual one, and the modality often glimmers through where the connection seems purely temporal. So the English *as* certainly gives a different coloring from *when* or *while*. The different tenses used after *ut* receive judicious treatment. In dealing with the pluperfect Dahl accepts Hoffmann's views. We may note that the form *uti* is not well authenticated in temporal sense, that *ut* in the sense of *postquam* (*ubi*) does not occur in Lucretius, that *ut* with the iterative subjunctive is confined to the silver age, while *ut* descriptive with the imperfect so common in Livy occurs already in Plautus. Asin. 343, *In tonstrina, ut sedebam, me infit percontarier.* We should be loth to admit, however, that *ut* has here wholly lost its modality. For us it has a shade of meaning quite distinct from *dum* or *quom* and not to be translated by *während*. On p. 131 Dahl shows that *ita* is not used by classical writers in the apodosis after temporal *ut*, although it is affected by some modern Latinists. The list of passages given on p. 146, where *ut* has local force, which Ellis in the case of Catullus attributes to Alexandrine influence, might doubtless be increased. In Parts IV and V the more difficult functions of *ut* come up for discussion, namely, the consecutive and final. For this section the views of Delbrück, Lange and Jolly on the subjunctive and optative have been carefully studied. In the nature of the subjunctive itself the author finds the bridge between *ut* = *as* and *ut* = *so that, in order that*. He regards *qui* clauses of characteristic as essentially the same with *ut* clauses, and of earlier development, as the relative pronoun is anterior to the relative adverb. After a patient analysis of characteristic *qui* clauses, in which the subjunctive is shown to be essentially potential in its nature, he finds the consecutive use of *ut* to be a development of the optative or potential side of the subjunctive, while the final use is traced back to the subjunctive proper, which is primarily an expression of the will. If we define an action by the circumstances which accompany or follow it, we must have the subjunctive with *ut* (and not the indicative), even though we feel that the subjunctive expresses a real fact, and even though the consciousness or will of the principal speaker has nothing to do with the fact as such. For example: *Ita curro ut sudem. I run in such a way as to sweat.* The characteristic of the action is that through it I begin to perspire. Through the

constant employment of this form one naturally reasons out the fact that I actually am sweating, and thenceforth the objective result becomes the prominent thing in the statement. Actuality is not more strongly expressed by *esse* with the infinitive or by the English *as to*. Both forms of statement represent the result only as possible and leave it to the reader or hearer to supply the impression of reality. Such, briefly stated, are the views of the author. Space forbids our following him into the details of his treatment of purpose and result clauses and of object clauses which express in a modified way purpose or result. Individual feeling will assert itself against this or that principle of classification. Dr. Dahl is, we think, particularly happy in his treatment of parenthetic *ut* clauses of result, like *ut omittam*, *ut non dicam*, and subjective result clauses like *ita agendum est ut omnia inter se cohaereant*. The discussion of the so-called elliptical sentences is not all that we could desire, and we should gladly have seen in an appendix some treatment of the compounds of *ut*, especially *neutiquam*, *utique* and *sicuti*. But few persons, we presume, such is the frailty of human nature, will be found to quarrel with the brevity of a work of over three hundred pages, on a single particle spelled with two letters.

M. W.

---

De Gladiatura Romana Quaestiones Selectae. Doct. Diss. by PAUL JONAS MEIER. Bonn, 1881. 52 pp.

In 1879 the Bonn Faculty set the following subject for a Preis-Arbeit: "Gladiaturae Romanae historia ex scriptorum et titulorum testimoniisque artis monumentis explicetur." Of the essay which received the prize this dissertation forms only a part. Needless to say the author has taken full advantage of the archaeological facilities which a University like Bonn offers, and in which we are so lamentably deficient in this country. Moreover, he has spied out the land and made the German Museums from Berlin to Trier yield up their gladiatorial treasures for his purpose. He has sifted the ancient sources and made some new discoveries. After two years' occupation with gladiators one may be pardoned perhaps a combative spirit, and if some knock-down blows are dealt to veterans like Lipsius, Friedlaender and Henzen, it only shows what training will do for the youthful prize-fighter. Dr. Meier has certainly shown himself a vigorous *tiro* and merits the title *spectatus*.

The introductory chapter begins with a puzzle from Suidas, states afresh the nature of Suetonius' work 'de historia ludicra,' and the probable dependence upon it not only of Tertullian, Isidorus and Cassiodorus, but also of the scholiast to Juvenal. Chapter II is entitled *De gladiatorum armaturis* with the following subdivisions: § 1. *de Samnitibus*. § 2. *de secutoribus*. § 3. *de opломachis*. § 4. *de retiariis*. § 5. *de Thraecibus*. § 6. *de Gallis et murmillonibus*. § 7. *de ceteris armaturis*.

Campanian hate first applied the name *Samnites* to gladiators. From the Campanians the Romans adopted the name together with the custom of gladiatorial shows. Lucilius is the first Roman writer to mention a *Samnis*. Literature and inscriptions are silent about them after the age of Augustus. Meier has an ingenious theory to account for this. New-fashioned names were found

for them. The *secutores* who fought with the *retiarii* were really *Samnites* and their equipment was the same. In Cicero ad Att. VII 14. 2 we may not read with Friedlaender *secutorum*, but must keep *scutorum* of the MSS, so that the earliest mention of *secutores* occurs in Suetonius Cal. 30. Another designation of them is found in CIL VI 631 > RET = contra rete. The *oplomachi* had also substantially the same equipment as the *Samnites*, and the name was introduced at the beginning of the Empire. They differed from the *secutores* especially in that they were matched with the *Thraeces* and not with the *retiarii*. Their helmets too were quite unlike. *Retiarii* lasted as long as gladiatorial exhibitions, but when they came into fashion cannot be definitely determined. An interesting description of their armor is given. They fought with *murmillo* and *secutores*; had neither *galea* nor *scutum*, but were furnished with a *galerus* (cf. Juvenal Sat. VIII 207, of which Meier gives a new interpretation). The name *Thraeces* indicates that Thracians taken in war were compelled to fight in the arena. In inscriptions *Thraex* is the more ancient, *Threx* the later form. TR also occurs, but *Thrax* is not authenticated. They fought with *secutores* and *murmillo*, and also with each other as appears from some *lucernae* at Berlin and Trier. Not so clear is the attempted proof from a Greek inscription CIG 2164, that the *murmillo* were pitted against each other. These latter took their name from the *μορμύρος* or *μορμύλος*, a fish which was attached to the helmet to be caught by the net of the *retiarius*. They were earlier called *galli*, which name went out of use at the end of the republic. The famous statue of the dying gladiator has lately been rechristened 'the dying Gaul'. Curiously enough, if we accept Weissenborn's view followed by Meier. Livy XXXIX 42, 11, *vis tu, inquit, quoniam gladiatorum spectaculum reliquisti, iam hunc Gallum morientem videre?* points to the fact that the Gauls were known as gladiators as early as the time of Cato the Censor.

Chapter III treats of *Quaestiones diversae* under the following heads: § 1. *De significatione "stans missus est."* § 2. *De suppositiciis seu tertiariis.* § 3. *De gladiatorum ordinibus.* What we have already said will, we hope, lead those who take a lively interest in gladiators to read these sections, of which it is impossible to give here even a summary.

M. W.

Einleitung in das Sprachstudium, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Methodik der vergleichenden Sprachforschung, von B. DELBRÜCK. Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel, 1880.

Introduction to the Study of Language, etc., by DELBRÜCK. Authorized translation by E. CHANNING. Leipzig, 1882.

This work with the authorized translation, to which a special preface is added by the author for the "English and American public," appears as the fourth volume of the Indogermanische Grammatiken. The purpose of the book is to give a short account of the development of philological study since the time of Bopp. The main title is slightly misleading, as the words "zur Geschichte," which are added in the sub-title, explains the real drift of the essay. It is not so much an introduction to the study of language from the standpoint of philological principles and their application, but rather an historical sketch with here and there an independent discussion of the theories involved.



The cis-Rhenish student will be apt to agree with the author's remark in his preface to the English translation, that the men who have contributed to linguistic research in England, France, and America have been somewhat neglected. 'In fact, to explain the nature of the essay the title should rather have been an historical introduction to the study of the works of German philologists.' But understanding this as the aim of the writer, the book may be considered a very useful summary. The author begins with Bopp, to whom 36 of the 137 pages of the work are devoted. The influence of Fried. Schlegel upon Bopp is commented upon at some length, his views on phonetic laws are discussed, s. 21, and it is pointed out (what is often overlooked) that in formulating his synopsis of phonetic changes Bopp himself belongs to those who do not insist on the inviolability of phonetic laws, but content themselves with admitting exceptions without feeling the necessity of discovering their causes. Es wird, says Delbrück, s. 23, allgemein zugestanden . . . dass Bopp auf dem Gebiet der Lautlehre seinen Nachfolgern am meisten zu thun übrig gelassen hat. Bopp's genius the author sums up as depending upon "das glückliche Aperçu" (s. 26) rather than as a result of learning and profound logical judgment.

More interesting is the following chapter, which treats of Bopp's contemporaries and successors to the time of Schleicher, Humboldt, A. W. von Schlegel, Grimm and Pott. A reminder, useful perhaps to non-German scholars, is given in the following allusion (s. 32) to "Grimm's Law" as "Das im Wesentlichen schon von Rask ausgesprochene unter Grimm's Namen gehende sogenannte Gesetz der Lautverschiebung." It is in fact one of the chief virtues of this essay that we are often reminded in it of the work done by men whose names and whose deeds have been obscured by the greater brilliancy of other scholars of the same epoch. Pott the author regards, although admitting that he has been often led aside by fancy, as one who has contributed more than any other to the establishment of sure phonetic laws.

Between the time of Pott's *Etymologische Forschungen* and Schleicher's *Compendium* important additions were made to philological science. In this period the author notes our better acquaintance with Indian literature, also the great help given by the lexicographic labor of Sanskrit scholars, the position which linguists begin to take in reference to phonetic laws, and most important of all, the attempt now made to separate with care the different languages from each other. A long section, some 15 pages, discusses August Schleicher. Passing from the question whether his Hegelian views influenced to any extent his philological opinions Delbrück shows us the main points of difference between the tendency of Schleicher and that of Bopp, and expatiates upon the one point "which best exhibits Schleicher's originality," the reconstructed Indogermanic *Ursprache*. In the *Compendium* Schleicher ascribes to this *Ursprache* an historical reality which in the *Chrestomathie* is contradicted. This point is treated p. 50 folg. As to the forms of the parent speech the author adds some sensible remarks. Whether we are to accept for this much-fought-over parent tongue the appearance at times claimed for it "lässt sich natürlich nicht bestimmen" (s. 53, s. 56.)

The chapter on *Neue Bestrebungen* is too short (s. 54-61). Worthy of chief consideration the author deems the question proposed by Merguet and answered by those scholars who have laid particular weight on the *Analogiebildung*—

especially Whitney, Scherer, Leskien—as to the possibility of new formations in separate languages when a completed inflection is postulated for the *ursprache*; and, secondly, the famous division of the *a*-sound, begun by Curtius and attacked by Brugman and others. Delbrück, of course, accepts the original *a-e* (*ā*). Finally, among recent discoveries, Osthoff's "r sonant" of the parent speech is regarded as "sehr wahrscheinlich," and Brugman's "Nasalis Sonans" is "nicht minder wichtig." We could have wished this chapter had been more extended, and more discussion given in regard to these points which the author merely notes and leaves.

From this point the historical sketch yields in part to an investigation (s. 61-102) of the Agglutination Theory. It will be scarcely necessary to speak fully on this part; the author's main conclusions are all negative. Dismissing the Evolution Theory, that pronouns are evolved from personal endings, the author takes up Ludwig's Adaptation Theory, which he finds quite as unsatisfactory as the other. According to Ludwig the so-called personal suffixes had originally nothing whatever to do with the pronouns. They were not used to designate person at all, but each suffix and pronoun arose independently. This theory is not so satisfactory as the former, because the strong resemblance of the personal suffixes to the pronouns is not explained by it, and the Vedic diversity of form is not so great as has been asserted by Ludwig. Without this latter support, however, the internal evidence is insufficient. Delbrück roundly charges Ludwig with answering the question, "Whence comes this resemblance of pronoun and personal suffix?" by a mere *Incompetenzerklärung*, or, in other words, he cannot explain it at all. In consequence the author leaves this theory as unsatisfactory, and reverts to Bopp's hypothesis that the endings arose from the pronouns. Under the three divisions of roots, noun, and verb, a detailed discussion is given. The key is struck in the first section, where, speaking of roots, the author says (s. 75): *Stellt man dennoch Wurzeln der Einzelsprachen auf, so haben diese keinen wissenschaftlichen Werth, sondern nur die Bedeutung praktischer Hilfskonstruktionen.* In regard to the form of roots, some five pages are devoted to the profitless inquiry as to whether dissyllabic roots may have existed alongside of monosyllabic ones. To those who are desirous of exact results as reward for philological labor on such themes we commend this whole chapter, s. 83. There may have been dissyllabic roots existing by the side of monosyllabic roots, *i. e.* we know nothing about it. S. 90, after discussing the views of Curtius, Scherer, Fick, Benfey u. a., in regard to the *Stammbildungssuffixe*, we arrive at the result: It is a matter of great doubt whether we shall ever succeed in reaching anything more than a probability in this field. S. 91, under *Casusbildung*: we may assume that case-suffixes were used at first to denote something like our present cases, and contained pronominal elements, or we can believe that stem-forming suffixes developed into case-suffixes, but "the uncertainty is here in all cases so great that after repeated consideration I have arrived at nothing but a *non liquet*." Not much more satisfaction is obtainable from the discussion of the verb which concludes the chapter. S. 99, the inflection has developed not all at once, but gradually; we cannot say however what the period of development was, for the material is not rich enough. This is the author's own confession, when he says in reviewing the whole chapter on agglutination: After a long and wearisome journey we arrived only at a bare *non liquet*, and seldom even at the possibility of

answering the question. The author therefore advises us to renounce this Sprachwissenschaftliche Metaphysik, and confine ourselves to what we can find out, making it our task to determine the fundamental forms (Schleicher's *Grundformen*) and explain from these the special forms.

At the beginning of Chapter VI, on Phonetic Laws, the author appears again as an advocate for justice, and this time in favor of Curtius. It is too often the custom with the younger school of philologists to speak of Curtius as too lax. He was, however, foremost in endeavoring to establish a sure foundation for phonetic laws. Curtius sees, however, not law so much as tendency at work in language. (Those who have heard Curtius lecture need not be reminded of the stress he is fond of laying on the "Sprachneigung.") Three principles, according to Curtius, are factors in forming language: Phonetic law, analogy, and preservation of sounds simply to conserve the sense. To this last point—sound saved by sense—Delbrück cannot agree, but proposes rather the principle of analogy. The first is the great fighting-ground of the younger school, whose shibboleth is: *phonetic laws admit of no exceptions*. Here we must, however, D. remarks, subtract all cases which are the result of analogy, for only after we have done this can we argue on phonetic laws. Even then comes the confession (s. 115): Auf inductivem Wege kann die Ausnahmslosigkeit der Lautgesetze nicht bewiesen werden. Deductively, then? Here we quote the substance of an important paragraph (s. 118), written against the idea that convenience plays an essential part in modifying inherited word-sounds, a theory maintained by Curtius and Whitney. Changes produced by climatic influences being left out of the question as a point too uncertain for argument, although maintained by Osthoff, we have to object against the theory of convenience the following facts: First, instead of asserting that love of ease plays so prominent a part in human society, we can say the opposite, viz. that most men give themselves a great deal of trouble to make their speech correspond to that of their associates (as for instance one who finds it hard to pronounce an *r* or *th*), and further, not only what suits the speaker, but what is pleasing to one's associates, is aimed at by the ordinary speaker. The principle that ease in speaking is the mainspring of phonetic change must, if this be true, be set aside. We find, then, the final cause of phonetic change in a more general theory, viz. that this occurs first in the individual, and not by the community. Such changes, originating, be it from ease, be it from fear of ridicule, be it from any other cause, starting with the individual, are propagated by imitation through whole groups or peoples. Against this lies the counterbalancing tendency to adhere to universal custom. Change in phonetic forms results from these two forces—one individualizes, the other equalizes. Finally, be it one or the other, both processes are made unconsciously. We have here the fundamental principle that underlies the development of one language from one another. Enlarging on this the author comes to two questions, where we can only note that his reply to each is a negation. First, Can it be assumed that change of sound appears in one series of words and not in another? Second, Can it be assumed that the same word-form may develop into different forms? In denying both of these propositions the author agrees with the school of Brugman, Leskien, etc. As an illustration of the latter, an example is quoted from the Greek: *μειζονος* and *μειζους* have not originated in the same dialect from *μειζονσος*, but *μειζους* arose from *μειζοσος*, whereas the other form is the

result of analogy with the nominative *μείζων*. The counter-opinion, advocated by Curtius, is that *μείζοντος* became on the one hand *μείζοσος* (*o* = nasal vowel), then *μείζοσος*, *μείζος*; and at last *μείζων*; on the other hand it became *μείζοννος*, then *μείζονος*. In criticising these theories we can observe that each is possible, neither is proved. The theory here advocated by Delbrück may commend itself to some scholars, as that of Curtius to others. It seems to us that this, like the agglutination theory, results merely in the same "kahles *non liquet*." Without sufficient data we may amuse but never satisfy ourselves.

The last chapter of this work gives us a review of the "separation of the races." It was Schleicher who first gave us the figure of the genealogical tree. Inside of this, as a result of the *Völkertrennungen*, he accepts three main groups: Asiatic, Slavo-Germanic, Greco-Italo-Celtic. Lottner divides into two, Asiatic and European. The latter is characterized by a common *l* in opposition to the Asiatic *r*. To this Curtius added the European *e* opposed to Asiatic *a*. Then comes the renowned "Wave-theory" of Johannes Schmidt, who admits no break between the different members of the Indogermanic family, but only one great continuous chain of mutual intercourse. Italic stands between Greek and Celtic, and Celtic between Italic and Germanic; Germanic, again, unites Celtic and Slavonic, etc. A modification of this theory was advanced by Leskien, who admits it as the first condition of things, but conceives a quickly entering barrier formed by natural state boundaries, which gradually prevented such intercourse and gave rise to special development of each individual element. To this latest modification Delbrück adds the warning given by recent investigation. This strikes at the data on which both the old ramification theory and the modern transition theory of Schmidt are founded. Mutual identity does not prove an original mutual community. Among new formations those elements can alone be adduced which are developed in common. Chief of these is the divided *k*-sound, *e* of European languages, *r* in the Italic middle and passive (as well as in the Celtic). Fick, however, showed that this *k* is an Indogermanic double sound; *e* is, again, also primitive; *r* of the Italic and Celtic may be, too, connected with the Indic endings *re* and *rate*. All, adds Delbrück, that we can say is that there was an original community of Indogermanic languages. It would be well not to attempt to classify them at all, with perhaps the exception of the undisputed group of Indo-Iranian. In other words, it were best to dispense with such terms as Greco-Italo-Celtic, Slavo-Germanic, and the like.

This book has been well translated by E. Channing. On comparison with the original no important deviation can be noticed, and it is high enough praise to say of any translation, as we can say of this, that it reads so smoothly that one would not suspect it was a translation. A judicious choice of words has kept the original sense of technical terms with great fidelity, and where such occur as are particularly difficult to render, the original has often been affixed. Disintegration (p. 103) does not exactly express the sense of *Verwitterung*, and it seems to us that the old *phonetic decay* is preferable. But it is at least more pleasing than the recent attempt of English translators to render this word by the extraordinary compound "weathering-away." In general, however, it were difficult to suggest alterations in the translation. The work has been well and conscientiously done—perhaps only a German scholar could appreciate how well, and how difficult it is to give us good equivalents for the German philological phraseology.

E. W. HOPKINS.

## REPORTS.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM, XXXV, 4.

1. Pp. 497-513. A. Ludwich. On the Paraphrase of Nonnus. Metrical observations and criticism of the text.

2. Pp. 514-528. H. Gelzer. The Period of Gyges. "Demnach ist es überflüssig die thörichte, noch neuerdings von Cox aufgewärmte Ansicht zu widerlegen, als seien Gyges und seine Gemahlin gar keine historischen Persönlichkeiten, sondern Sonnengottheiten und Naturpotenzen." Both the mythical and the historical elements of the story are discussed,—the latter minutely and in the spirit of reconstruction.

3. Pp. 529-542. H. van Herwerden. Ad Plutarchi Vitas. Continued from XXXV, 3. Corrections proposed for 117 passages.

4. Pp. 543-563. F. Schoell. The Interpolation of Cicero's Speech for Caelius. S. argues that Halm went too far in denying the genuineness of the passages added by a later hand in the Cod. Parisinus, and discusses several passages (§§ 24, 35, 52, 80), attempting to detect the traces of genuine tradition. The method followed seems fully justified; but S. does not and could not claim precise certainty in the results reached. He admits the partial interpolation of the passages in question, and continues: "Nur hat man ganz Aehnliches und Gleiches, wie das Beanstandete bisher bestehen lassen, hat die einmal festgestellte Thatsache der Interpolation nicht consequent verfolgt und ausgebeutet." S. attempts this neglected duty. In reporting his views, as the interesting nature of the subject makes it desirable to do fully, it is generally impossible to report or to attack his arguments; and in the reader's interest the order of the oration rather than of Schoell's discussion is followed. In 3 he writes *habitam esse hodieque haberi*, striking out *summam*. In 4 he strikes out *ista*. In 5, *si nituntur iudicio suorum*. In 6 the words *ut ad me revertar* are condemned,—unnecessarily. In 7 he rejects *maledicendi* (*hunc m. locum*). In 8, *qualis es talem te existiment* and *at non sine argumento*, writing *sine ulla suspitione*. In 9 he writes *nemo M. Caelium*, striking out *hunc*. In 10 he proposes *studuerunt, mecum existimetur*. In 18 he strikes out *quod quidem iam in hac aetate minime reprehendendum est*, and further on *migrationemque*. In 21 he writes *gloriosum etiam esse*, striking out *hoc*. In 22 he strikes out *facillime fingi*. In 23 he writes *et si Asicio plus profuit*, striking out *causa*. In 26 he rejects *non me haec movent* and then writes *etenim una cenasse*, omitting *eos*. In 30 he writes *ut oportet respondere*, omitting *ita*, and further on casts out *aurum sumptum a Clodia, venenum quaesitum quod Clodiae daretur, dicitur* and *non crimina sed maledicta*. In 31 the Wolfenbüttel MS has *paravit quam locum*,—the *quam* not appearing in other MSS. S. remarks that *paravit* needs an object and suggests *paravit opem*. In 35 he writes *ut verear*, omitting *et*. In 36 he writes *ex tuis igitur sumam aliquem*,



and further on *fuisti non numquam eius domi, in hortis*. In 37 he writes *vix ferendi*. At the end of 45 he proposes to read *quod nos facimus non modo agendo dicendoque, verum*, with a hint that perhaps the *dicendoque* is an interpolation. In 48 he condemns *ego rem definiam*. In 49, *sese in meretricia vita collocavit* and *aquis, navigatione, conviviiis*. At the end of 50 S. cuts off everything after *impudentia*, holding the words to be of the nature of marginal explanation, with the possible exception of *et huic*, which may be a corruption of a genuine word. In 54 the words *neque neglexisset* are condemned. S. supports his attack by calling attention to the following *neglegere potuisset* and *neglegeret*. At *suo gladio se iugulat*. Cicero recurs three times with cumulative force and with evident intent to the argument of the original *neglexisset*, just as he recurs twice (*leniter ferret—dissimulandum putaret*) to the *tulisset* which follows *neglexisset*. In 57 he casts out *quibus omnia committantur—qui versentur isdem in voluptatibus—per quos gerantur*. I have little hesitation in admitting the fact of interpolation here, much more in accepting his metes and bounds. Possibly the words to be rejected are *quibus occulta credantur* and nothing more. In 71 S. writes *Vettiano stupro*, omitting *nefario*. In 77 he rejects *bonorum virorum*. In 78 he writes *cum suo coniuge et turpissimum*, striking out *fratre*. He finds in the *fratre si* of the Wolfenbüttel MS a corruption of an old marginal note, *fratre sc.*

5. Pp. 564–568. P. Egenolff. In *Herodianum Technicum critica*. A collation of a manuscript at Copenhagen, showing the need that still exists for an accurate edition of Herodian.

6. Pp. 569–577. H. Hagen. On a new Epigram with the heading *Octaviani Augusti*. The epigram is in a manuscript of the tenth century at Berne, which contains the text of Priscian and a variety of extracts from various sources, many of them written in *notae Tironianae*. Hagen gives a facsimile of the epigram and deciphers it as follows:

Octaviani Augusti.

Convivae, tetricas hodie secludite Curas:

Ne maculent niveum nubila corda diem.

Omnia sollicitae vertantur murmura mentis,

Ut vacet indomitum pectus amicitiae.

Non semper gaudere licet. Fugit hora; iocemur!

Difficile est Fatis subripuisse diem.

A considerable commentary follows, in which every syllable is discussed in an effort to prove that the lines are in the manner of the Augustan age and fit the character of the man whose names (not his name) are found with the epigram. A note of the editor offers the reader a warning against too ready credulity.

7. Pp. 578–585. L. Ahrens. The Inscription from Olympia, No. 362. This inscription has been published and explained by Kirchhoff in the *Archaeologische Zeitung*. Many readers will doubtless be glad to see it in the form which Ahrens gives it. He reads:

Ἄ Εῤῥάτρα τοῖς Φαλείοις. πατριὴν θαρρήν καὶ γενεὰν καὶ ταῦτῳ, | αἱ ζή τις κατα-  
ράσσει Εἤρρενον Φαλείω. αἱ ζὲ μῆπιθειαν τὰ ζῆ | καὶ αὖ ὅρ μέγιστον τέλος ἔχοι καὶ  
τοῖ βασιλᾶες, ζέκα μναῖς κα | ἀποτίνοιαν Εἰκάστος τῶν μῆπιποέντων καθυταῖς τοῖ Ζῆ

Ὀλυν | πίοι. ἐπένποι ζέ κ' Ἑλλανοζίκας, καὶ τᾶλλα ζίκαια ἐπενπ | ἔτω ᾧ ζαμιωργία.  
αἱ ζέ μῆνποι, ζίφνιον ἀποτινέτω ἐν μαστρά | αι. αἱ ζ(έ) τις τὸν αἰτιαθέντα ζικαιῶν  
ἰμάσκοι, ἐν ταῖ ζεκαμναῖαι κ' ἐ | νέχο(ιτ)ο, αἱ Φειζῶς ἰμάσκοι. καὶ πατριᾶς ὁ γροφένς  
ταῦτά κα πάσκοι. | (ἄκ)ω(ητῖ) κ' ἔο(ι) ὁ (πῖ)ναξ ἱαρός Ὀλυνπῖαι.

In the form ἐπένποι Kirchhoff sees an equivalent of ἐκπέμποι, Ahrens of ἐφέποι.

8. Pp. 586-606. C. Paucker. De Latinitate Claudiani Poetae Observationes. Statistical remarks on peculiarities of vocabulary, formations and meanings of words, syntax.

9. Pp. 607-609. A. Philippi. The Battle of Arginusae and the Decree of Kannonos. A very plausible argument to prove that the words κατὰ τὸ Καννοῦ Ψήφισμα in Xen. Hell. I 7, 34 are interpolated.

10. Pp. 610-626. W. Ribbeck. Homeric Miscellany. Discussion of μάχης ἐπ' ἀριστερά and of the ναύσταθμος, with not a little polemic irony directed at Naber's theories about the growth of the Iliad.

11. Pp. 627-630. F. Bücheler. Old Latin. Two brief chapters,—the first treating an inscription recently found near Spoleto (Spoletium), which we copy: honce loucom nequs violatod neque exvehito neque exferto quod louci siet, neque cedito nesei quo die res deina annua fiet; eod die quod rei dinai causa (f)iat, sine dolo cedre (l)icetod. Seiquis violasit, Iove bovid piaculum datod; seiquis scies violasit dolo malo, Iovei bovid piaculum datod et a. CCC moltai suntod. eius piaculi moltaique dicator[ei] exactio est[od]. This inscription B. refers to the period preceding the Second Punic War. He quotes the explanation of δικάτωρ from Hesychius, and finds it so confirmed by the evidence of this stone as to leave no doubt that *dicator* is a good Latin equivalent of *dictator*. The *res dina* of the inscription supports the reading of the Cod. Vetus in Plaut. Epid. 314, where B. writes: *dum rem dinam faceret, (quae) cantaret sibi*. The second chapter treats the word *sedulo*, of which queer etymologies are more or less current. It is, like *obviam*, *denuo*, simply two words in one,—*se dolo*=*sine dolo*. From the adverb thus formed sprang up, by a familiar process, the adjective *sedulus* and its further derivatives, not found earlier than Cicero.

12. Pp. 631-640. Miscellany. N. Wecklein reads μάχης in O 459 and rejects 460—doubtless right. His change in II 128—ἐλῃσι for ἐλωσι—seems over-acute. He remarks: "If the ships burn up, the Trojans cannot get possession of them." Very true; but if the Trojans get possession of the ships, they can spread the fire.

F. Bücheler recurs to the inscription from Olympia copied above, and calls attention to its importance in illustrating the conflict between law and ancient custom. The riddle about the meaning of ἐπένποι, etc., is surely solved when B. points out the phonetic equivalence of ἐνπει and Latin *inquit*. He compares *coinquere* and refers to the various senses of *putare*, *legere*. But in this case he translates ἐπένποι by *indictet multam*.

A. Stachelscheid gives the marginal notes in Bentley's copy of Gellius.

J. Klein treats of P. Rubrius Barbarus, Praefect in Africa under Augustus; of Sulla Cerialis, one of the victims of Heliogabalus; and of L. Tullius Pon-

tianus Gentianus, a favorite of Faustina—all with the aid of materials furnished by the inscriptions.

F. Schöll replies to a critic of his notes on Quintilian (R. M. XXXIV 84 ff.)

J. Freudenthal adds a few words to his discussion of Phavorinus (R. M. XXXV 408 ff.)

J. Steup calls attention very neatly to several loose joints in the armor of Wilamowitz.

# XXXVI, 1.

1. Pp. 1-10. B. Schmidt. Tribute to the fame of Bogen on an Attic Hermes. The epigram upon Kimon's victory at the Strymon, which was graven upon these Hermae in the Agora at Athens, is quoted both by Aeschines (in Ctes. 184) and by Plutarch (Vita Cim. 7), the text given by the manuscripts of Plutarch being in the main decidedly nearer the original. S. points out that Plutarch can hardly have borrowed the epigram from Aeschines, that the epigram, in fact, does not really belong to the text of Aeschines. He thinks it probable that Plutarch borrowed directly from some compiler of historical documents, most likely Krateros, and that we have in the text of Aeschines a modified interpolation from the same source. But the word *πρώτοι* in v. 4 of the epigram is puzzling. Of course the form upon the actual stone would have been *ΠΡΟΤΟΙ*. This S. interprets as dative singular *πρώτῳ*, and understands it to refer to Bogen, whose story, told by Herod. VII 107, must have been in the mouths of all Athenians at the time when these Hermae were set up. The neat and satisfactory character of this explanation can hardly be denied.

2. Pp. 11-25. F. Ruehl. On the Codex Laurentianus, 53, 35, with additional matter touching the most recent investigations on Cicero's Letters. A letter from Florence, giving a mass of palaeographic detail about the handwriting of Petrarch and the much-discussed manuscripts of Cicero's Letters.

3. Pp. 26-37. W. Christ. Notes on Homer. C. defends the combination of subjunctive and optative in Γ 54, 55, by citing the similar expression in a closely similar situation at Α 386. In the latter passage the subjunctive is necessary to the metre. C. refers also to X 42, μ 345, ρ 539. But X 42 is hardly a parallel passage, and perhaps Aristarchus is not so very much to blame for writing *ἔδοιεν* there. Of course we have all been told he did not know much Greek; but then, he did know some. C. then gives nearly a page to E 338, reaching the conclusion: "So lange daher niemandem etwas besseres einfällt, wird man bei der Vermuthung Heyne's [*i. e.* to regard *πέπλον* as neuter and write *δ' οἱ*] stehen bleiben müssen, wenn man auch Bedenken trägt dieselbe geradezu in den Text aufzunehmen." δ 692, C. gives good reasons for doubting the optative *φιλοίη*, proposes to read *φιλείη*, defends the latter as a good subjunctive form at length and very satisfactorily. The optative *ἐπιβρίσειαν*, ω 344, is troublesome; and C. proposes to help the matter by treating the words *ἐνθα . . . ἔασιν* in 343 as parenthetical. The change of the tense is paralleled in κ 349. The form *εἰοικῦναι*, Σ 418, C. declares to be a monstrosity. He writes *νεήρυσσιν Φεφικῦναι*. In ψ 517 he points out that *ὅς τε* and not *ὅς ῥα* is wanted—*ὅς τε ἄνακτα*. In I 455 he regards *οἶσιν* as a possessive of the first person. E 293, he writes *ἐξέλθον*; Α 706, *διείλομεν* for *διείπομεν*.

4. Pp. 38-49. J. Asbach. The Chronology of Pliny's Letters.

5. Pp. 50-86. G. F. Unger. The Lupercalia. Four topics: (1) The names of the priestly fellowships, the Quintiliani and Fabiani. Unger concludes that resemblance of sound in the names to *quinquare* (= *lustrare*) and *februare* led to the choice of the Quintilii and the Fabii as the most suitable patricians for headship in these early priesthoods. (2) Evidence of change in the significance of the worship during the third century before Christ. This change came from the belief which grew up in the efficacy of the ceremonies in preventing the barrenness of women. Earlier the only purpose had been to ensure the strength of the Palatine fortifications against invasion. (3) The names of the divinity worshipped. U. refers the name Lupercus to *lua*, *lues*, and *parco*, and explains it as *averruncus luis* or *luae*. Lupercus has been generally identified with Faunus. U. argues against this, maintains that in early times the real name was a matter of mystery. (4) Concluding that this real name was *Inuus*, U. discusses the Etruscan divinity *Inuus* at length, holding him in his turn to be Juppiter, the god of the sky, appearing under a special name and with special attributes.

6. Pp. 87-115. Th. Bergk. On Aristotle's account of the Athenian Constitution. Blass has recently published (Hermes XV) some fragments, found on tattered bits of Egyptian papyrus, which he ascribes to Theopompus. Bergk makes it exceedingly probable that Aristotle is the real author—that the fragments belong to the πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων. The most important fragment throws some light on the state of parties at Athens before the legislation of Solon. Another relates to the institution of ostracism, and confirms the tradition that Kleisthenes fell a victim to his own innovation.

7. Pp. 116-119. O. Ribbeck. New Readings. "Da man nicht wissen kann, wann entweder die von Ritschl eingesetzten tres viri oder der Strassburger Thensauochrysonicocrypsides zu der Bearbeitung des Miles gloriosus kommen werden, . . . so will ich einige Mittheilungen über neue Palimpsestlesungen, welche ich der Freundlichkeit G. Löwe's verdanke, nicht länger zurückhalten." The Ambrosianus has in 683 ESSEE (or T) ME (or I) IDMULTOLEPIDI-USEST, and after *bona uxor* in 684 LUDUSDURUSTSISITUSQUAM, and in 685 EAPOSSITINUENIRI. R. writes: *liberum esse me, id multo lepidius*, and *nam bona uxor ludus durust, si sit usquam gentium, ubi ea possit inveniri*. In 686 A. has *eme, mi vir*, but leaves out *tibi*. In 689 the palimpsest has Fleckenstein's *e somno*, in 690 Ritschl's *munerem*, in 692 Scaliger's *praecantrici*, in 697 *quae supercilio spicit*. In 708 A. has *hi apud me aderunt, me curabunt, visent quid agam, quid velim*. Ribbeck thinks, if this be genuine, *si* must stand at the beginning of the verse. In 712 there is a *me* after *abducunt*; in 715 there is a *me* before *certatim* (so Bugge). In 716, A. has TUAMUITAMABES. R. writes: *tuam vitam vales*. In 720, A. has *si ei forte fuisset*; in 721, *aut de equo uspiam*; in 722, DE (or I) FREGISSET; in 724, *usui est* (so Ritschl's conjecture); in 737 and 738 *iam* is omitted. In 740, stands *quantum sumptum*, and R. writes *quantum sumptuum fuerit*. In 745, *serviendae servituti*. In 747 *si illis aegrest* (so Camerarius); then MIHIEO (or ID) QUOD (R. *mi id quod*); then *meo remigio rem gerunt*. In 748, apparently *odios*. In 791, *ex matronarum*. The close of 793 R. had already assigned to Pleusicles. This he finds con-

firmed by the new reading of 794: ATSCIETISPOSTEAECQUA, *i. e.*, at *scietis post eae ecqua*. In 797, A. has *quasiq̄ue*, and *hoc* instead of *hunc*. In 800, two letters stand before *dabo*. R. writes *ego rectis meis* (sc. manibus) *ei dabo*. After 1401, A. has a verse beginning with AG. R. conjectures this may have been an address to the lorarii. Ritschl's note on 1406-8 is a mistake.

8. Pp. 120-126. E. Meyer. Original sources for the war of Antiochus the Great with the Romans. An argument in support of Nissen's view (against Mommsen) that Appian is substantially dependent upon Polybius, and that Polybius got his account from Greek sources (mainly Rhodian). Livy owes much to Polybius, but shows something of the influence of Roman annalists.

9. Pp. 127-130. F. v. Duhn. The harbor of Pompeii. A portrait-bust, a gold chain, two bracelets, a ring, a lamp, a drinking cup, were found all together a few years ago near Pompeii, and passed into the hands of a resident of Naples. In the wall by which these objects were found was a marble tablet bearing the inscription SEX. POMPEIVS SEX. L. RVMA NEPTVNO.V.S. L. Evidently a sailor had here paid a vow made while at sea to Neptune. This inscription, then, closely fixes the position of the (or a) temple of Neptune. But Neptune's temple must have been close to the water. And the place of this inscription (near the "Molini") confirms Ruggiero's view of the ancient coast-line. This is plausible, but hardly conclusive.

10. Pp. 131-160. Miscellanies. P. Cauer proposes to read, β 203, οὐδ' ἀποτίσαι. For the construction he compares, among other passages, Φ 565.

W. Ribbeck continues from XXXV 469 his notes on the scholia to the Iliad.

N. Wecklein gives critical notes on several Greek authors. Aesch. Sept. 326-332 and 338-344 he proposes should change places, and in like manner 835-839 and 843-847. For 385 he proposes ὁμφάκων τρυγεράν δρόσον, an attractive conjecture at first sight, though it may well be doubted whether this gives what must have been the Aeschylean word-play in ἀρτιδρόποις ὠμοδρόπων. W. remarks that the first stasimon is capable of a natural division into twelve parts, perhaps divided among the twelve choreutae. Sept. 282, he proposes ἐγὼ δ' ἐπάρχους ἐξ. 480, μηδέ μοι λήρων φθόνηι. 482, τοῖσι δὲ δυστομεῖν. Several emendations of the scholia on the Septem follow: 310, τῆς ὑγρασίας δεσπότης. 398, τὰ ἐπίσημα οὐδὲ ὄπλα, and φέρων αὐτὰ γένοιτο γενναῖος. 457, Ἐτεόκλω ἐξέθορεν ὁ κλῆρος. 692, παρορμῇ εἰς τὸ κτανεῖν τοὺς ἀνδρας. 727, ταῦτα κρνεῖν κατὰ τῶν παίδων. Soph. O. T. 896, τί δέι με θυοσκεῖν,—comparing the gloss of the Cod. Laur. with Hesych. on θυοσκεῖν. In both places the words are disordered. W. conjectures that the marginal explanation in the Cod. Laur. was originally ἱεροῖς πονεῖν ἢ τοῖς θεοῖς χορεύειν; the words of Hesych.: θυοσκεῖν ἱερὰ παρέχεσθαι ἢ θεοῖς χορεύειν. The combination seems doubtful at the best; nor can I feel that the objections to χορεύειν in the text of Sophocles are weighty. Ai. 179, W. proposes χαλκοθώραξ λῆστιν Ἐννάλιος; 919, φλεβὸς μελανθέν. Tr. 328, κακῇ μὲν αὐτῆς; 1018-1021, μεῖζον ἂν εἴη ἢ δεῖ ἐμοῦ σωκεῖν ὃν δὲ σύλλαβε σοί τε γὰρ ὄμμα ἐμπλεον—υ υ υ υ—ψάω. Frag. 761 (Dind.), κοπίς ταχεῖ ἐθήχθη καὶ ταχεῖ ἄμβλύνεται. Eur. Hipp. 1148, ποῖ τὸν τάλαν' ἐκ πατρίας γᾶς. Iph. A. 213, ἐκόνει; 251, πτερωτοῖσιν ἀρματήλατον; 674, αἰσιον σκοπεῖν. Cyc. 505, σκάφος ὀλκάδος γεμισθεῖς. Frag. 773, τί ποτε τοῦδ' ἐπαίτιον; 899, βάρβαρος μέθων.



Lysias XII 88, τῆς παρ' αὐτῶν τιμωρίας; XIII 36, the words ἐν ᾧ . . . ἐδύνασθε are stricken out. In 90 W. writes οὐδένα γὰρ ὄρκον οἱ ἐν Πειραιεὶ τοῖς ἐν Πειραιεὶ οὐδ' οἱ ἐν ᾧ στεί τοῖς ἐν ᾧ στεί ὤμωσαν. XXV 5, W. thinks the clause ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας τιμωρεῖσθαι cannot have been written by Lysias, since punishment of the Thirty is out of the question, but may have been added by the client who delivered the speech. Was it, then, this client who revised the speech for publication? 22, W. writes: τοὺς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δεδιότας. In 27, τοῖς δ' ἀλλοτρίοις περὶ ὁμοιοῖας. Plat. Lach. 189 C, striking out δέ before μεταξὺ,—καὶ αὐ ἂν ἀκούσω, ἐὰν μεταξὺ ἄλλοι λόγοι γένωνται, οὐ πάνν μέμνημαι,—a very neat and convincing correction. Apol. 21 D, τῶν δοκούντων σοφωτέρων εἶναι,—striking out ἐκείνων. 27 E, ὥς οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν καὶ δαιμόνια καὶ θεῖα καὶ δαίμονας καὶ θεοὺς ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ αὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μήτε δαιμόνια μήτε θεῖα μήτε δαίμονας μήτε θεοὺς, οὐδεμία μηχανὴ ἐστίν,—a thoroughly good sense with changes which are, under all the circumstances, not violent enough to excite a scruple.

W. Dittenberger calls attention to a long-known Attic inscription (Boeckh, Opusc. VI 6, 386) with the name Μασαννάσα.

K. K. Müller gives critical notes on a Heidelberg MS. containing excerpts under the name of Planudes.

A. Viertel explains the mistake of Flavius Blondus in thinking that Petrarch was not acquainted with Cicero's letters to Atticus.

A. Duncker reports the discovery of a fragment of a manuscript of Cicero de Officiis in the binding of an old book at Cassel.

K. J. Neumann shows that Minucius Felix, in his Octavius 7-10, borrowed from the lost argument of Cotta in Cic. de Nat. Deorum III. The place from which the extract was taken followed III 65.

A. Stachelscheid sends from London Bentley's emendations to Marcianus Capella.

J. W. Förster puts in tabular form the results of searching the inscriptions for the age of Roman soldiers on entering the service. He finds one or more at every age from 13 to 37, one at 46 and one at 47. The whole number of cases is 600. Of these about one-half entered between the ages of 18 and 21, about a quarter at the age of 20.

J. H. WHEELER.

#### MNEMOSYNE, Vol. IX, Part 4.

All the matter in this part is contributed by Cobet, except an article of some twenty pages by Herwerden on Isaeus. The first paper (pp. 361-369) contains remarks and emendations on Hesychius. One of the earliest of these is on the following: θριπόβρωτος: οἱ Λάκωνες σφραγίσιν ἐχρῶντο ξύλοις ὑπὸ σητῶν βεβρωμένοις. On this Cobet remarks that the word to be explained has evidently fallen out; and this must have been θριπήδεστος. 'Veteres dicebant ἔδομαι (κατέδομαι), ἐδήδοκα, ἐδήδεσμαι (κατεδήδεσμαι), ἡδέσθην (κατηδέσθην), ἔδεσμα, ἔδεστα καὶ ποτά, ἐδώδιμος. Haec omnia apud Graeculos in desuetudinem abierunt proque iis dici coepta βρώσομαι, βέβρωκα, βέβρωμαι, ἐβρώθην, βρώμα, βρωτὰ καὶ ποτά, βρώσιμος, quorum pars apud Veteres in usu fuit, sed rariore et fere poetico. Sic igitur ὁ ὑπὸ θριπῶν κατεδηδεσμένος a Veteribus dicebatur θριπήδεστος, a Graeculis θριπόβρωτος.' After illustrating further the use of these

forms he says: 'sed in futuri forma vehementer Graeculi peccant. Prorsus interiit *ἔδομαι*, κατέδομαι, proque eo Favorinus βρώσσομαι dixit, et faex Graeculorum et barbari Graece balbutientes in Aegypto et Palaestina *φάγομαι* constanter usurpant. Reprehendit haec omnia Phrynichus in Bekk. *Anecd.* p. 37, 30: *ἔδει—ἔδονται*: οἱ μὲν ἀμαθεῖς φάγη λέγουσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος. Ὁ δὲ Φαβωρίνος—τῷ βρώσσομαι ἐπὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐχρήσατο. In Vetere ac Novo Testamento constanter *φάγομαι* scribitur et in secunda persona etiam vitiosius *φάγεσαι*.' Two or three other specimens of these notes may be given: 'ἀμακίς: ἀπαξ. Κρήτες. Scrib. ἀμάκις ex antiquo et obsoleto ἀμός pro εἰς, cuius certa impressa vestigia sunt in οὐδαμοί, μηδαμοί Ionice pro οὐδένες, μηδένες, et οὐδαμινός id est οὐδενὸς ἄξιος, ut οὐτιδανός ex οὐτις, quod constanter pro οὐδεῖς in epica poesi ponitur. Item in permultis adverbis veluti in ἀμῶς γέ πως id est ἐνὶ γέ τῳ τρόπῳ, et οὐδαμῶς nullo modo, nullo pacto.' 'ἀφύων τιμῇ: τὸ ἔλαιον, ἐπεὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἔψονται. Saepe miraberis apud Hesychium absurdas interpretationes, quae nec coelum, ut aiunt, nec terram tangunt. Habes h. l. luculentum exemplum. Respicit Grammaticus (Didymus) locum Aristophanis ex *Acharn.* 939:

εἰ δέ τις ὑμᾶς ὑποθωπέσας λιπαρὰς καλέσειεν Ἀθήνας,  
εὐρετο πᾶν ἂν διὰ τὰς λιπαρὰς ἀφύων τιμὴν περιάψας.

Sententia perspicua est: *qui Athenas appellat λιπαρὰς (nitidas et pingues) eum honorem vobis tribuit quae apuarum esse solet*, nempe quae ob pinguedinem laudantur. Quid autem Didymo facias, qui serio annotavit ἀφύων τιμὴν esse *oleum*, quod et ipsum absurdum est et salsum Aristophanis dictum ἀδιανόητον reddit? Sed festinanter talia ὁ βιβλιολάβας in chartam coniecitbat.

In the next article (pp. 380-399) Herwerden offers notes and emendations on some 120 passages in Isaeus. Most of these are interesting; but few can be made available for this report. On VII 38 οὐκ ἐκ συμμορίας τὴν ναῦν ποιησάμενος ὥσπερ οἱ νῦν he writes: 'coniecit Naberus πορισάμενος, quae correctio, quantumvis lenis, neutiquam admittenda esse videtur, siquidem trierarchi non magis naves πορίζονται quam ποιῶνται. Civium est παρασκευάζειν sive παρασκευάζεσθαι τὴν τριήρη sive εὐτρεπίζειν. Vide v. c. Dem. p. 1228, 5. Nisi fallor tota haec periodus sic est emendanda: καὶ τριηραρχῶν τὸν πάντα χρόνον διετέλεσεν οὐκ ἐκ συμμορίας τὴν ναῦν παρασκευαζόμενος (aoristo locus non est ob verba τὸν πάντα χρόνον διέτ.) ὥσπερ οἱ νῦν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν αὐτοῦ δαπανῶν, οὐδὲ δεύτερος αὐτὸς ὢν ἀλλὰ κατὰ μόνας οὐδὲ δὴ ἐτη διαλιπὼν ἀλλὰ συνεχῶς, οὐδ' ἀφοσιούμενος ἀλλ' ὡς οἶόν τ' ἄριστα [παρασκευαζόμενος]. Participium quod suo loco restitui olim inde motum erat ad explicanda verba ὡς οἶόν τ' ἄριστα, quo facto nescio quis in antiquitate Attica plane hospes pessime supplevit ποιησάμενος. Locus sic constitutus vide quam sit egregie compositus. In tribus ultimis membris identidem participium et adverbium sibi respondent: δεύτερος ὢν—κατὰ μόνας, διαλιπὼν—συνεχῶς, ἀφοσιούμενος—ἄριστα. Quot veneribus nos privavit inscita magistrorum sedulitas!' On VIII 24, οὐ μὴ εἰσεῖ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν he writes: 'bene sic correctum est pro οὐ μὴ εἰσῆς τὴν οἰκίαν, sed post οἰκίαν requiritur signum interrogandi; quae notissima est *velandi* ratio. Alia est ratio vocularum οὐ μὴ seq. Coni. aut Fut. sine interrogatione, quibus aliquid fore *vehementer negatur*.' On IX 24, λέγων ὅτι θεῖος εἴη Ἀστυφίλῳ καὶ ἀποφανοίῃ διαθήκας [ἐκέεινον καταλελοιπότεα] εἰ τις αὐτῷ [l. αὐτῷ] κοινώσοιτο, he writes: 'licet grammaticae non adver-

setur locutio ἀποφαίνω τινὰ διαθήκας καταλελοιπότες, multum tamen dubito vocabula ἐκεῖνον καταλελοιπότες esse ipsius oratoris, siquidem constans est iuris Attici formula ἀποφαίνειν διαθήκας, ut infra § 25, ubi eadem repetuntur, utramque vocem omissam videbis—De pronomine αὐτῷ ab eiusmodi locis alieno rectissime statuit Naberus. Addam in talibus Atticis optionem esse inter οὐ, οἱ, ἐ, σφῶν, σφίσι, σφᾶς et αὐτοῦ, cett. Antiquiores fere, ut Thucydides, illam, paullo recentiores hanc sequi assolent, Isaeus semper.

The next article (pp. 400-440) is by Cobet, and is entitled 'Annotationes ad Livium.' The purpose of it is to controvert the opinion of Mommsen on two points. The first is that Perseus (Röm. Gesch. I<sup>6</sup>, p. 753; Eng. Tr. II, p. 340) "inherited along with the kingdom the troubles, resentments, and hopes of his father. In fact he entered with the utmost determination on the continuance of his father's work, and prepared more zealously than ever for war against Rome: he was stimulated moreover by the reflection that he was by no means indebted to the good will of the Romans for his wearing the diadem of Macedonia." Cobet endeavors to show on the contrary that the war was forced by the Romans on Perseus. To decide this point he says 'ante omnia de testium fide et auctoritate constare debet. Quatuor esse putantur Polybius, Livius, Diodorus Siculus, et Appianus in *Macedonicis*, sed sunt duo tantum; namque Livius totus a Polybio pendet et Diodorus nil nisi incredibili impudentia Polybiana descripsit. Quis sit ille testis optimus et veracissimus et rerum gestarum aequalis et παρρησιαστής, qui in Appiano libro lateat, deprehendisse mihi videor et infra ostendere conabor.' Cobet sums up extracts from Livy and Polybius with 'quibus si credimus Romani de bello Macedonico ne cogitabant quidem antequam Eumenes in curia crimina de Perseo detulit.' He then quotes from Appian, *Maced.* IX 'ante adventum Eumenis οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ταχέως ἀν-ξανόμενον τὸν Περσέα ὑφεωρῶντο καὶ μάλιστα αὐτοὺς ἠρέθιζεν ἡ τῶν Ἑλλήνων φιλία καὶ γειτνίασις, οἷς ἔχθος ἐς Ῥωμαίους ἐνεπεποιήκεσαν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι στρατηγοὶ κτ᾽'; and after a long exposition of this text he continues: 'quum diligenter mecum quae-rerem quis Romanorum fuisset tam audax ut scriberet' the above passage, 'venit in mentem Catonis. Immodice libera videtur lingua eius qui dicat: *Romanis tam cito crescentes Persei opes suspectas fuisse et male urere Romanos quod Perseus Graecorum amicitia floreret et magistratuum Romanorum iniurias ingens in animis Graecorum peperisse Romanorum odium.*'

In the next 22 pages Cobet collects the passages bearing on the origin and course of the third Macedonian war, and endeavors in several to show that Appian relies upon the elder Cato as his authority. The second point on which Cobet corrects Mommsen is (R. G. I<sup>6</sup>, p. 770; E. T. II, p. 360) the statement in Polybius and Livy (44, 13) *de tractatis inter Eumenem et Persea conditionibus amicitiae*, which Mommsen declares 'was as certainly a fable as any newspaper *canard* of the present day'; saying further 'that no proof was found either in the papers of Perseus or elsewhere is sufficiently certain.' Against the last statement Cobet quotes Diod. Sic. XXXI 7, 2 ὑπόπτως εἶχον οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τὰ πρὸς τὸν Εὐμένη ἐνεκεν τῶν γραμμάτων τῶν εἰρημένων ἐν οἷς συμμαχίαν ἦν συνθεμενός πρὸς Περσέα κατὰ Ῥωμαίων.' Cobet shows that the change in the feelings of the Romans towards Eumenes after the fall of Perseus which Mommsen attributes to a determination 'to render all the Hellenic states, friend and foe, forever incapable of harm,' is better explained by assuming

that the reports about the bad faith of Eumenes, which Mommsen admits were current, were also true; and as to the unlikelihood of the astute Eumenes engaging in any negotiations with the enemy of Rome, he says: 'magis mirandum est quo pacto ὁ πανουργότατος βασιλεὺς, tam cautus, tam perspicax quam callidus et astutus non providerit id fore quod factum est. Scilicet conversa repente est fortuna belli. Omnia propemodum μέχρι τῆς Παύλου στρατηγίας Romanis adversa fuerunt, et difficillimi belli taedio, ut vidimus, ad pacem componendam inclinati erant animi. Eumenes operam suam venditat Perseo Romanis aut faventibus aut certe non improbantibus. Itaque securus per occulta colloquia et legationes id quod susceperat aggressus est. Sed ubi Pauli virtute repente debellatum est, Romani in pacis conciliatorem Eumenem eodem animo fuerunt quo in Rhodios eadem conatos.'

Cobet then (pp. 441-444) comments on the interpretations of an 'antiquissima inscriptio nuper Romae reperta' furnished by Dressel and H. Jordan. The letters COSMIS occur. 'Quid est COSMIS? Bücheler respondet COMES: Jordan contra COMIS esse putat' and connects it with κόσμος. 'Fugit subtilissimi ingenii virum non *comis* et κόσμος, sed *comis* et κῶμος esse inter se cognatissima. Nempe ἀνὴρ κόσμος (ordentlich) plus gravitatis habet quam comitatis. Contra κῶμος (κωμάζειν, κωμαστής) ad amussim cum Latino *comis* congruit. Οἱ κωμάζοντες inter se optime volunt, sunt *humani, benigni, hilares*, et quia in lautis epulis sumtui non parcitur, iidem *splendidi* sunt et *prodigi*. Res est, ut vides, manifesta. Derides, inquires. Fortasse, sed tam facile est ista imitari.' After more criticism in the same vein Cobet says: 'non premam denique suspicionem, quae mihi diligenter haec omnia consideranti subnata est. Saepius in Italia et nonnumquam etiam extra Italiam factum est ut inscriptiones circumferrentur spuriae aut per iocum aut ab impostoribus fictae. Ante hos paucos annos in patria nostra scurra nescio quis protulit inscriptionem litteris Runicis conceptam, cuius prima verba erant OBA et RONIE aut RONJE. Quis nostratium non meminit ridens quantum ineptiarum illa inscriptio pepererit, donec tandem KERN noster sollertissime fraudem deprehendit? Idem nunc Romae factum esse suspicor. Commentus est id scurra aliquis ut homines pereruditos sed non admodum acutos ludificaretur. Νᾶφε καὶ μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν.'<sup>1</sup>

The last article (pp. 445-448), as well as parts of previous pages otherwise unoccupied, contain notes by Cobet on various passages of Galen. There is also supplied an index to this ninth volume.

C. D. MORRIS.

ARCHAEOLOGISCHE ZEITUNG. Jahrgang XXXIX. 1881. Four Numbers.

I. The first number opens with an article by O. Benndorf on some technical points in the manufacture of Greek vases. A theory held by Jahn, Semper and Blümner is criticized in the light of observations made at the British Museum by the writer. His view is that in the older vase manufacture the process was not simply to cover the original clay with black and then to produce outline drawings in red by discovering the color of the clay, but that after these *graffiti* were thus made their lines were filled with a white pigment, which seems to be the same used, especially for the naked portions of female figures, as an

<sup>1</sup> See Amer. Jour. Phil., III, p. 107.

*engobe*. Of this white filling very extensive traces are noticeable in the collection at the British Museum. *Graffiti* pure and simple seem to occur only in coarse and careless work; the better vases have all a white or a light yellow filling. In some cases even a dark red filling is noticeable. Traces of the gradual disappearance of this the writer sees in the scratched outline around the (black) hair of the later figures in dark red. This outline it seems was long filled with red according to the technical traditions of the older style, but finally in the perfected style no incision was made—a hair's-breadth of the plain red surface was left instead.

Next Gustav Krüger discusses a bust said to represent Euripides, which is among the comparatively recent acquisitions of the British Museum. He agrees with Mr. Newton in considering it an admirable work, and gives in a rather dim photograph both its front and its profile. It is strikingly like other heads supposed to represent Euripides, and yet sufficiently unlike them, the writer thinks, to make it certain that this bust was not from the same original portrait-statue of the poet with the others. There seems no reason why any one who is so inclined should be restrained from taking this bust as an excellent portrait of Euripides.

Ernst Curtius then discusses the 'Telamones' or 'Atlantes' which adorn and dignify a certain bronze tablet on which is seen an inscription in honor of Apollonius, the whole dedicated by the town of Anisa. I have said 'Telamones,' because two are represented in the cut at the head of the article. Only one is really preserved, but the longing eye may still see the toes of the second figure; and, with such a hold upon it, some one has found it the simplest and easiest thing in the world to enrich us with the whole figure. Surprise at this unexpected good fortune should not, however, interfere with the writer's general discussion of the use of 'Atlantes' and Caryatids in ancient architecture and decoration. His statement of the limits within which such figures were used in the better days of art is what might have been expected. The rule was: You must not call upon any figure to carry what it is manifestly too weak to bear, nor must you put all that it can support on its back and then make it dance or reel in any of the various irrelevant and exhausting ways exhibited by the Atlantes and Caryatids of the decline of Art.

Then comes an article by Löschke describing an interesting work in clay found at Tanagra. Perhaps we can stretch the term vase so as to include this tripod in clay. The three supports give an opportunity for Medusa's two sisters to pursue Perseus. The fact that Perseus is beardless and unarmed is compensated for by the safe distance which separates the foot of the tripod where he is represented from the two occupied by his grinning pursuers. The cauldron supported and surrounded by this agonizing pursuit is adorned with a more genial scene. Here we see a bacchanalian offering, but the cover brings us back to a chase—this time we see a hunter and two dogs in hot pursuit of a hare; just such a scene is described as represented in beaten metal on the shield of Heracles.

This last scene provokes the writer to an investigation, in the course of which he maintains that this 'vase' was of Athenian workmanship. Further he claims that the theme of a hare pursued by dogs was borrowed in the earliest



days from workers in beaten metal by the potters and handed down more or less mechanically. Aside from the combination of dogs and a hare, the earliest art seems to have given only mechanical rows of this or that species of animal. The mention of a scene of this kind in the shield of Heracles confirms what is apparent after an examination of many early works like this one. The pursuit of a hare was a favorite subject with decorators of vases at Athens and Corinth from the middle of the eighth century to the beginning of the fifth. If we wish to go back of the time when the Shield of Heracles was probably written, then we are referred to Layard's Nineveh, where rows of running dogs may be seen used in decoration in stripes alternating with rows of running hares, or again, rows of alternating dogs and hares; rows of running men are similarly used. From this to the scene under discussion the early decorators advanced by putting two and one together, which in this case has made four, *i. e.* one man, two dogs and a hare. Various common scenes from Homer—so they came to be regarded—are then shown to have had a similarly mechanical and purely decorative origin.

Among various short notices in this number it is interesting to find an attempt to defend Apollo from that libel upon the beauty of his later god-head—the Apollo of Tenae in the Munich Glyptothek. Perhaps many will be too glad to believe that this is no Apollo.

II. The second number is opened by an article from F. Hultsch, who is regarded as especially qualified by his researches to enlighten the world as to the various Greek units of measure. In this article is examined the bearing which the new measurements of the Samian Heraion by M. Barthélémy de St. Hilaire have upon our knowledge of the unit of length used by various architects on various Greek temples. To begin with, the ratios of the various dimensions of the Heraion are examined. The new measurements, which are rather vague, suggest a correction of Gell's figures. This is made somewhat arbitrarily to suit the convenience of the writer, who proceeds to ask: Is the simple proportion of 1 : 2 found in the ratio of length to breadth in the case of the lowest or the highest of the steps or terraces on which the Heraion is built? The breadth of the uppermost step is 50.67 m. If the length were twice this it would be 101.34 m. This is the measurement of length which the writer argues for in an abstruse and complicated plea of which no summary is here desirable. The general considerations, suggested by Hultsch's analysis of the dimensions of the Samian Heraion, the Ephesian Artemision and other temples, he thus expresses: "The various ratios"—of the number of pillars in front to the number on the side, of the breadth and length of the lowest platform to the breadth and length of the cella—"move this way and that, and the course of their variation may be compared to a pendulum in motion. The simple relation of 1 : 2 we may compare to the pendulum at rest; this we find *once* in the conspicuous dimensions of the temple. Starting from this ratio, by addition and subtraction we reach the other dimensions. They stand in new ratios to each other, each one of which has a harmony of its own. The combination of them all gives a surprising rhythmical concert which may be not inaptly compared to a great musical composition." Returning to the narrower but more com-

prehensible discussion as to what unit of measurement was practically employed, our writer tells us that several were used side by side; he mentions two ells, one royal and one national—this last was subdivided into thirds, two of which made a foot, in very common use.

Just at this point it is well to leave the second number and take up by anticipation the first article in the fourth number, which is a very careful attack upon Hultsch's premises and conclusions, written by Wilhelm Dörpfeld, known in connection with the Olympian excavations. Dörpfeld practically maintains these points: (1) "All the actual measurements used by Hultsch are inaccurate; he has changed some arbitrarily, and others he has reached by arithmetical blunders." (2) "Granted for a moment that the dimensions used in forming the ratios are correct, 'the resulting self-evidence (*Durchsichtigkeit*) of proportions' is a delusion and a snare." (3) "It is an insult to our common sense to suppose that an architect would measure the front of his building with one unit and the side of it with another."

Returning to the second number, we find R. Engelmann describing two Spartan Mosaics (Plate 6) which are to the unilluminated eye particularly unpleasant. One of them represents Achilles at Scyros and the other the rape of Europa. It is consoling to hear that they are of late workmanship, belonging probably to the first century after Christ. Plate 7 is a colored lithograph reproducing a statue of Aphrodite, a rather fleshly and distinctly fleshy goddess here, leaning upon a very unpromising smaller figure of Elpis. The interest of this group, unearthed at Pompeii in March 1873, is derived from the well preserved traces of color, which are somewhat imaginatively reproduced in the plate and are minutely described by K. Dilthey. The chiton of Hope is green, but she is otherwise rather yellow. Aphrodite is chiefly arrayed in gold ornaments and yellow garments as far as she has raiment at all.

Next P. Robert discusses (in connection with various other vases obviously representing the same scene) an Athenian *aryballos* upon which is painted the embassy to Achilles. The heroes of the scene are Odysseus, who has just ended his telling speech; Ajax, sullen and muffled up in his grief, who has only half listened; Phoenix, who stands behind engaged in a very pretty quarrel of his own with Diomedes; Diomedes is turning away disgusted with so much vain delay. The Odysseus here—unlike the same hero in other vase-representations of this scene—suggests the influence of Phidias and his Parthenon sculptures. No doubt these designs exercised a great influence upon the development of art in all its subsidiary branches. The writer further maintains that in this representation the account of Homer has been followed and Diomedes has been proleptically introduced. Finally, A. Milchhöfer gives some account of one of the many monuments in honor of the great historian Polybius. It is disheartening to note that these numerous monuments in various places were dreary repetitions of one and the same design.

III. In the third number we have an article by K. Lange on the Athena Promachos of Phidias and kindred representations of that goddess. He argues that the figure of Athena so common on Athenian coins is a careless

reproduction of the great original Promachos statue, or was at least suggested by it. This leads to his theory that the shield of the Promachos was raised aloft and did not rest on the ground. The statue was not enormous, and therefore the decorative reliefs of the shield could, he argues, be seen. But at the same time he seems to urge that because they could not be seen the great Phidias was not responsible for them and they were added later. It ought to be just as impossible archaeologically as it is gastronomically to have your cake and eat it too, therefore this point in the argument is not well taken. In seeking to identify with the general type of the Promachos other statues and reliefs enumerated by Sybel as coming from some one early original, the writer claims that the Parthenos was an earlier creation of Phidias than was the Promachos. Pausanias says the Parthenos came after the Promachos, but this means that it took a much shorter time to finish and cast in bronze what was really the later conception (the Promachos) than was required to elaborate the chryselephantine perfections of the Parthenos.

Next comes No. III of A. E. J. Hollwerda's Olympian studies. This chapter is devoted to the Pentathlon. Pinder's work and an article by Percy Gardner have raised a question as to the terms on which the prize in the Pentathlon was awarded. Pinder begins by fixing the order of the five contests as follows: *ἄλμα ἀκόντιον δρόμος δίσκος πάλη*. Then he claims that no athlete who failed to achieve a given minimum in leaping was allowed to enter the contest of spear-throwing; the four best spearsmen entered the foot-race; the three best runners cast the discus, and the two best discus-throwers were allowed to wrestle. This distressing complication of the game was proved impossible by Percy Gardner, who, however, substituted a theory of his own about the matter. It is to overturn this theory that Hollwerda comes forward. Having with a vigor worthy of a competitor in the Pentathlon utterly routed all men with views on the subject, our author proceeds to give his own, which he says is really an old theory propped up with new quotations. Three out of the five events gave the victory. Under this rule, if a man won the first three or the second third and fourth, the whole contest was decided without recourse to the *πάλη*. As to the order of the events he quarrels with Gardner and his Panathenaic Amphora, which is no better than others where the order is reversed. His conclusion favors this order: *ἀκόντιον* (third) *δρόμος* (fourth) *πάλη* (fifth); whether *ἄλμα* or *δίσκος* came first is, he thinks, past our finding out. The article closes with some detailed observations on the *ἄλμα δίσκος* and *ἀκόντιον*.

The next fifteen pages of this third number are devoted to O. Puchstein's article on the vases of Cyrene. This account is the forerunner of a more detailed treatise on the subject. The writer attacks what Luynes has said to the effect that it was impossible to classify Greek vases according to their place of manufacture with any certainty. In these later times, he declares, there has been great progress toward such classification. Then he takes a list of vases classified as Cyrenaic by Brunn, Klein and Löschke, and shows the points of similarity, which proves that there was a special tradition among the potters of Cyrene.

(1) The favorite form of cup adopted by the Cyrenaic makers was a slight modification of the hemispherical cup. About half an inch below the rim its semicircular (elliptical) outline is drawn in and thence spreads out, forming a lip. In all these cases the bowl is placed on a high, slender support and has two horizontal handles, but this of course is not peculiar to Cyrene.

(2) Many traces and peculiarities point for the potters of Cyrene and Rhodes to a common inspiration, which came from Cyprus and its school of workers in metal. "Both in their ornamental details," says the writer, "and in the composition of more elaborate scenes, the vases of Cyrene like those of Rhodes show the influence of a school of workers in beaten metal who must have been Phoenicians and probably worked in Cyprus." The writer specifies peculiar lotus-patterns and the decorative use of the pomegranate as especially characteristic of Cyrene.

(3) As to the subjects selected for illustration by the painters of the Cyrenaic school, they are largely 'genre' scenes. Prometheus also is a favorite, and Heracles, but hardly any of the greater gods. This may, however, be due to an accident that has left comparatively few vases from Cyrene. In a footnote to Mr. Clarke's admirable report upon his investigations at Assos, attention is called to one of the scenes from a Cyrenaic vase reproduced on Plate 12 of this number. The scene is the combat between Heracles and the Centaurs, the same represented in low relief on the temple at Assos. A common peculiarity in the two representations consists in the introduction of Centaurs with human forelegs along with the ordinary kind of Centaur with four horse-legs.

IV. The fourth number has less that is of especial interest. Of the first article directed by Dörpfeld against Hultsch I have spoken above. F. Dehnecken describes minutely a very beautiful, though sadly mutilated, bas-relief in the Louvre. It represents in one and the same scene a visit of Dionysus at the board of a mortal and the apotheosis or canonization of that mortal. W. Gerhard gives a careful account of certain rather uninteresting splinters of pottery recently gathered together in the Brunswick collection. A. Milchhöfer writes about some very meaningless Spartan works of art.

Max Ohnefalsch-Richter gives a brief account of his excavations near Larnaka in Cyprus. He dug into a "Phoenician grave" and it soon turned out to be a "Roman bath."

In the account of the various meetings in honor of Winckelmann we hear of Professor Schaafhausen at the Bonn meeting, where he gave an account of Fraas' unearthing Athenian vases and bronzes near Stuttgart. These vases date back, it appears, to the fourth century B. C.

It will not be possible to give any account of the most important and interesting Olympian Inscriptions published in three of these numbers. A list of numbers must suffice. In the first number are published and explained Nos. 381-392; in the second Nos. 393-414. In the third number there are none; in the fourth number are published Nos. 415-423.

Finally come the reports from Olympia. In Report 46 Wilhelm Dörpfeld tells of the final discovery of the Pelopion. This had been sought

before in vain ; a long trench had been dug to find it, but, as luck would have it, the trench passed through two corresponding openings in the wall of enclosure. Chance finally yielded what forethought long had sought. To the east of the Pelopion traces, supposed to be the great altar of Zeus, have been found, and also they have uncovered the Leonidaion mentioned by Pausanias.

In Report 47 Georg Treu gives some account of the heads of marble, the bronzes and the terra-cottas found during the last year. Among them are a head of Aphrodite, suggesting the school of Praxiteles, and fragments (most useful in restoring the group) of the head of Sterope from the eastern tympanum of the great temple.

LOUIS DYER.

GERMANIA. Vierteljahrsschrift für deutsche Alterthumskunde. Herausgegeben von Karl Bartsch. Wien, 1881. Heft 3, 4.

Fedor Bech begins the third number with a paper proposing emendations in L. Ettmüller's edition of Heinrich von Meissen (Frauenlob). B. specially treats of Ettmüller's reading of certain passages in Frauenlob's Kreuzleich, Minneleich, Frauenleich and Sprüche.

A. Raszmann follows with an interesting article "Wodan und die Nibelunge," in which he reviews the opinions that are held by Mühlhoff (Z. f. deut. Alt. 23, 113) and others on the much debated subject of the Volsungs, and takes occasion to correct some of his own statements in his Helden-sage, 1, 22. In treating of the probable origin of the Nibelungenhort and its baneful influence on each possessor, R. brings forward evidence of a close connexion between the ransom of the Asas (Andvari's gold) paid by them for the slaying of Hreidmar's son Otter, and some mythological facts which are found among several Indo-European races. Assuming the etymological relation of the Norse word *otr* with the Sanskrit *udra*, the Greek *ὄδρα* and the Slavic *vydra*, the article attempts to prove by citations from the Avesta, from the Greek Herakles myth and Slavic mythology, that the killing of an *udra* (otter) must have been looked upon by the Aryans as a fearful crime for which only death could atone. The water was held sacred, and with it the animals that inhabited it. Whether Raszmann has made out his case as regards the connexion of this fact with the killing of the otter and the subsequent terrible penalty in the story of the Volsungs may be doubted, but at all events every one interested in the subject ought to read this clever article.

K. Rehorn subjects the early authorities for the life of Bruder Berthold (1250) to a critical examination, beginning with the abbot Hermann of Niederaltaich (1242) and closing with the compilers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The life of Berthold has in late years been investigated with such care by Grimm and Pfeiffer, and in 1876 again by Wackernagel and Rieger in *Altdeutsche Predigten und Gebete*, as to show numerous conflicting statements in the writings of Berthold's earliest chroniclers.



We still need a full and reliable history of this remarkable preacher. Rehorn contributes some additional matter touching the subject, and hopes that it will not be long before some master-hand will collect the materials offered and give to the world a complete picture of the life and labors of brother Berthold.

C. M. Blaas furnishes Bruchstücke aus einem mitteldeutschen Arzneibüchlein, formerly in the city archives of Kronenburg and now in the imperial library at Vienna. J. Haupt of that city places the date of these fragments in the beginning of the fourteenth or end of the thirteenth century.

Tell-Dellingr-Heimdall, by Friedrich Neumann. This paper criticises sharply a contribution "Neues zur Tellsage," by A. Rudolf in Herrig's Archiv 63, by whom Tell Dellingr is conceived as the morning. However much we may differ otherwise with Neumann's views, in this we must confess we incline to his opinion, "wenn Tell Dellingr der morgen ist, so ist die ganze Tellsage willkürliche erfindung." The suggestions offered by N. with reference to the legend are more ingenious than convincing. The incidents of the Tellsage, he thinks, might by a poetical change imply occurrences manifest to every eye during a thunderstorm. The sun and thunder-clouds are personified. Tell, representing the sun, meets his enemy Gessler, the thunder-clouds. In the small cloud, forerunner of the storm, that caps the mountain, we have Gessler's hat, which Tell heeds not. Gessler's eye flashes and the distant rolling of thunder betokens his wrath. Gessler approaches and Tell must shoot at his child. The sun's children are mankind, and before a thunderstorm the rays of the sun (Tell's arrows) sting, i. e. the heat is oppressive. The first dark clouds step before the sun, and bounding forth to the right and left, his rays appear under them. They are the remaining arrows (?) that would have pierced Gessler's heart if the first had chanced to hurt the boy. But enough. We can quite appreciate the readableness of the article and give the writer credit for the best of intentions, but we could have welcomed a less fanciful explanation of the legend. The arguments which Neumann advances to establish identity of Tell Dellingr with the Sun-god and Heimdall = Heimdeglingr, seem to us likewise susceptible of modification.

The origin of the proverb "Morgenstunde hat gold im munde," forms the subject of a short paper by Robert Geete. Dissenting from L. Tobler (Germ. XXV) who explains mund = os and assigns to the saying a mythological origin (Heimdall), Geete believes the word *mund* to mean *hand*—Morgenstunde hat gold in der hand—(A. S. munt, O. H. G. munt, O. N. mund = manus), and does not see why we should go to mythology for an explanation of the proverb when it might very naturally have sprung up among the people.

Fedor Bech sends a short article on the word *leben* in the following lines of the Nibelungenot (ed. Bartsch) 698, 3-4:

Do gewan dar umbe Hagene ein zornlichez leben;  
Er sprach "jan mac uns Gunther zer werlde niemen gegeben."

In the introduction of Bartsch's Wörterbuch zu der Nibelungenot, p. 31, the strange expression in this verse "ein leben gewinnen" is commented upon.

Other M. H. G. dictionaries do not speak of it. Bech has found in the course of his M. H. G. readings several instances which show that *leben* often has the sense of *muot* = animus. In a second paper Bech quotes a passage from *Denkwürdigkeiten des Hallischen Ratsmeisters Marcus Spittendorf* ed. Opel, p. 272, and proves by it that in the last half of the fifteenth century the language of the common people in Halle an der Saale was still the Low German, entirely distinct from the Middle German which we meet in the city documents of that time.

The text of a *Faust* volkslied found in Graz by Adalbert Jeitteles, and fragments of a *Tristan* poem sent by the custos of the Bohemian museum in Prague to H. Lambel, complete the list of the original articles in the third number.

Felix Liebrecht reviews the second edition of the third volume of Leon Gautier's great work *Les Épopées Françaises*, and bears witness to the eminent merit of this almost exhaustive work on the subject. The work displays throughout the unflagging industry and scholarly research of Gautier. The notes contributed by Liebrecht in his review are a valuable addition to Gautier's text.

H. Lambel criticises K. Sass's essay *Über das Verhältniss der Recensionen des niederdeutschen Spiels von Theophilus*, Elmhorn 1879. Of the three known copies of the Low German *Theophilus*, the Helmstädt, the Stockholm and Treves MSS, the essay assigns to the first, from internal evidence of the poem, a place nearest to the lost original. With this Lambel agrees (and we may add that most German scholars have done so long ago), but dissents from the views of Sass as to the relation which the Stockholm MS bears to the other two.

The Miscellany contains a communication from Adelbert Jeitteles, "Ein Augsburger Judeneid," and A. Raszman sends additional matter regarding his article *Wodan und die Nibelunge*. There are some minor communications besides from Fedor Bech, J. Franck, Reinhold Bechstein, A. Birlinger, Dr. Möller, Pfarrer Falk and Alfred Landau. Among the personals we notice the death of Dr. Eduard Müller (author of the well-known *Etymological Dictionary of the English language*) and of Adalbert Kuhn.

A. Jeitteles' final answer to A. Schönbach's sharp criticism of J.'s *Altdeutsche Predigten aus dem Benedictinerstifte St. Paul* closes the third number.

The fourth number leads off with a paper by Reinhold Bechstein, *Drei Conjecturen zu Hartmann's Iwein*. The reading of verses 3372, 73

"Nû jach des ein ieglich man  
Wie er verloren wære,"

in the Lachmann and Bech editions MSS (a) Bb, was rejected by Paul (*Beiträge* I, 374) and in this B. thinks he was justified. Variants show a better reading, thus D: nu dûht er sî ein gevellich (c. siecher, d. schickerlich) man. They all, however, lack more or less the suitable adjective describing *man*. Bechstein proposes the adjective *schellich*, *schellic* = crazed, and reads in

his Anthology, Stuttgart 1881, "nu dûhte er si ein schellic man," which expresses well the impression of the maiden upon beholding Iwein. In v. 3474 (ed. Fedor Bech): darzuo si vil stille sweich, Bechstein derives the word *sweich* from *swichen*, *geswichen* = *entweichen*, *verlassen* (cf. Wb.), not from *swigen* = *schweigen*, and supplying the dat. *im* prints: darzuo si im vil stille gesweich. Vs. 3254-56 (ed. Lachmann) read:

doch meistert vrou minne  
daz im ein krankez wip  
verkêrte sinne unde lip.

Bechstein inserts the acc. *in* before *vrou* in the first line.

J. Kottenkamp follows with an article embodying further results of his Tristan studies. In the space of six pages he examines and explains a number of verses in the epic which hitherto seem to have been misunderstood by translators. K.'s essay *Zur Kritik und Erklärung des Tristan* Gottfried's von Strassburg was published in 1879.

P. Piper furnishes a list of Altdeutsche Pflanzennamen, and K. Frommann discusses the orthography and use of the pronoun *das* and the conjunction *dasz* in Luther's Bible. Originally the same word, they were spelled alike—M. H. G. *daz*, N. H. G. (fifteenth century) *das*. The older (M. H. G.) spelling *daz* and its contraction *dz* (changed in the second half of the sixteenth century to *dasz*) were, however, not entirely dropped, but often used indiscriminately for *das* by the printers. Luther in his earliest and later works employs the spelling *das* for both pronoun and conjunction. The proper definition of the word, particularly in the Bible translation, must therefore always be well considered. F. adduces a number of examples from the Luther Bible in support of this. After comparing some thirty different editions (older and later) of the German Bible, F. finds that v. 19, chap. 1 in Paul's Epistle to the Romans reads in all of them: Denn *dasz* man weisz, *dasz* Gott sey, ist ihnen offenbar, *i. e.* the existence of God is manifest to them. Although this is the meaning generally given to this passage by Germans, it is contrary to the original text (cf. Engl. Bible). The Bibles of Herborn (1619), Pfaff, Gerlach, and the Nürnberg edition of 1703 express the verse differently, and none of them found out the correct reading of the Luther text, which simply needs (according to our present spelling) the substituting of *das* (= was) for *dasz* (man weisz), cf. Canstein edition 1867 and edition of the Prussian Bible Society. F. further calls attention to Luther's use of *das* for *dasz* *es*, cf. Jer. 2, 24: Wenn es vor grosser Brunst lechzet, und läuft, *das* (*dasz* *es*) niemand aufhalten kann, etc. In Isaiah 51, 6 we find the pronoun *das* = eine kleinigkeit, ein nichts: Der Himmel wird wie ein Rauch vergehen, und die Erde wie ein Kleid veralten, und die darauf wohnen, werden dahinsterven wie *das*. Luther explains in a marginal note, "Solch *das* mus man mit dem Finger zeigen, als schlug man ein Kliplin mit Fingern." cf. R. Hildebrand in Grimm Dict., Vol. 5, 1209, also W. Grimm in Vol. 2, 806, and Eng. transl. of Bible passage.

Ludwig Laistner examines the Provençal Alba published by J. Schmidt in the Z. f. deutsche Philol. 12, 335, and concludes "Dass der verfasser ein geist-

licher und das gedicht selbst ein geistliches ist." L. also contributes a minor article Zum Reinfrid und Archipoeta, and Fedor Bech sends Nachträge appertaining to articles in Germania XXIII, XXIV, XXV.

A list of recent publications in the field of Germanic philology by the editor Karl Bartsch, and brief communications from R. Maurer, H. Deister, A. Jeitteles and F. Liebrecht, close the fourth number.

C. F. RADDATZ.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK. FLECKEISEN U. MASIUS. 1881.

I.

1. Pp. 1-16. A. Römer of Munich, who is well known to the readers of the Jahrbücher by his articles on the scholia of Homer, reviews Hermann Schrader's edition (Fasc. I, Leipzig, 1880) of the fragments of Porphyry's Homeric Problems, relating to the Iliad. The catechetical *ζητήματα* and *λίσσεις*, introduced by Aristotle, appear in their most dreary state in the problems of Porphyry. Some of them, it may well be, rest upon observations of Aristarchus, but others combat his views. In the scholia of the first hand the *ζητήματα* appear in their clearest, purest form. Many additions of little worth and concerning matters of little interest were introduced by the second copyist. Much which belongs to the later hand is given in this edition as in the MSS, under the name of Porphyry, without any strict criticism on the part of the editor, who has collected and arranged the fragments without separating the chaff even when the end of a scholion was indicated in Ven. A by a new lemma. The editor was careless also in neglecting too much the various readings in Ven. B. Schrader had made himself, however, thoroughly familiar with his subject, and his work may be welcomed as a careful treatment of an uninviting theme.

2. P. 16. R. Arnoldt of Königsberg conjectures *ἀδρανεῖς* for *ἀφανεῖς*, Aristides XI, p. 130 Dind.

3. Pp. 17-30. H. Blümner of Zurich, the editor of an elaborate edition of Lessing's Laocoön, discusses the new interpretation of the Laocoön group. Archaeology has made great strides since Winckelmann's day. New points of view have been opened and old theories discarded. From the literary sources, students had reconstructed the sculptures in the pediments of the temple of Zeus, at Olympia on the model of the Parthenon, as it was known that their sculptors were scholars or contemporaries of Phidias. The fragments are brought up from the alluvial soil of the valley of the Alpheus, and are found to be of comparatively hasty, rude workmanship. The same excavations have shown that the Hermes (Antinous) of the Belvedere, which was thought to belong to the school of Lysippus, is really Praxitelean. So the discoveries at Pergamos, which promise to concentrate upon themselves the art-interest of the cultured, seem likely to change our views of the condition of Greek art under the successors of Alexander. Yet the Laocoön group will always be of interest because of the great names, Lessing, Goethe, Winckelmann, etc., connected with it. In spite of the heap of literature which has collected on the subject, no one up to this time has been able to decide whether this group belongs to the time of the *diadochi* or to the first century of our era. The question now

proposed, however, relates only to the interpretation of the group. Its *motive* (the killing of the father and both sons) was never disputed until less than three years ago, when Brunn made known the view of his friend Bernard Stark, that, as in the *Iliupersis* of Arctinus, only the father and younger son were killed by the serpent. To this view Stark seems to have been led by Goethe's remarks concerning the beautiful climax—the elder son only entangled by his arm and foot, the younger son firmly held in the serpent's coils, the father bitten by the other serpent as he endeavors to free his sons and himself. The artist, according to Goethe, chose the moment of the highest interest; fear, horror and sympathy are all expressed. The poet's observation is to be corrected in so far as the younger son is *in articulo mortis* and the father's efforts are all directed to oppose the serpent, to save his own life. It is true that the elder son seems so slightly involved that he might be freed, but did the artist intend to give the impression that he *would* be freed? This must be answered in the negative. There appears no determined effort for safety on his part. He yields to the danger and forgets himself in his father's sufferings. In a moment the left arm of Laocoön will sink, and the serpent having accomplished his work with him, has but a slight movement to make to reach this eldest son in the most vital spot. Sophocles and the following poets make both boys die, and the artist was more likely to follow them than Arctinus. Surely if the artist worked in the reign of Titus he must have followed Vergil's form of the story.

4. Pp. 30-32. Ziegler of Stuttgart notices Heinrich Kraz's translation of and notes to the three orations of Pericles as given by Thucydides (Nördlingen, 1880), and briefly calls attention to his views on different passages.

5. Pp. 33-44. Schweizer Sidler gives an appreciative review of H. Jordan's critical contributions to the history of the Latin language (Berlin, 1879). Jordan has shown that the influence of the Etruscans was not preponderating in the choice of the form in which Greek names were adopted in the early Latin language. He holds that they were borrowed from some dialectic form, not making his view so precise as G. Meyer, who thinks the Etruscan names were derived from Ionic forms, the Latin names from Doric forms. Pollux, Polluces is derived from Poluduces, Poluluces. The change from *d* to *l* in this word is assumed as taking place on Italian soil, as also the change of *ss* to *x* in *Ὀλυσσεύς*, Ulixes, or Uluxes. Jordan's arguments to prove that the old Latin *Melerpanta* is not a capriciously altered form but comes from a dialectic *Μελλεροφάντης*, are not considered convincing.

6. Pp. 45-58. Brix of Liegnitz, the editor of Plautus, likens the contents of Langen's contributions to the criticism and exegesis of Plautus (Leipzig, 1880) to the treasures discovered with spade and shovel in Greece and Asia. L. has studied Plautus's versified language of popular conversation without taking as his canon the literary language of Cicero. No one has determined the peculiar Plautinian use of so many constructions. The result is valuable not merely for the explanation and criticism of the plays of Plautus, but also for the history of the development of the Latin language in forms and syntax and meanings of words. Thus *paenitet me* does not mean 'to be sorry' in Plautus; nor *commodus*, 'favorable'; nor *resistere*, 'to oppose'; nor *reprehendere*,



'to blame.' Plautus does not use the forms *dis*, *dites* for *dives*, *divites*, nor *mori* for *moriri*, nor the constructions *orare ab aliquo*, *precari ab aliquo*, *cupere ut*, nor *statim* in temporal sense, nor *unus idemque*, nor *invidere* with a dative of the thing, nor *debere* with the infinitive. Such positive determinations of usage not only cut off many superficial conjectures, but also give a valuable criterion for the criticism of suspected passages. The book, the ripe fruit of long-continued studies, is recommended as an *ἐγχειρίδιον*, especially as an introduction to the study of old Latin for the younger generation.

7. Pp. 59-79. W. Brandes commends the careful presentation of a mass of new material by Peiper on the MS tradition of Ausonius in the eleventh supplementband of the *Jahrbücher*, but differs from him on two points. Peiper conceived of an original collection of the Ausonian poems as the source of both our collections—that found in Vossianus (V) as well as that found in Tilianus (Z), but that the latter contained the gleanings of smaller poems which were added after the author's death. But from certain letters it is known that Ausonius never published his works except as he sent them one by one to his friends. By a comparison of the dated poems it is shown that V was compiled later than Z. But Z seems to be neither the first volume of the poet's collected works nor the last gleanings after his death. It was begun by some friend of the poet about 370 A. D. and received additions until about 383 A. D. V has suffered some lapses, but represents the edition which the poet at his death left unpublished, with the addition of poems which were afterwards collected, probably by the poet's son Hesperius, from letters, loose sheets, etc.

8. P. 80. P. Stengel of Berlin corrects a prevalent view that only female or emasculated male victims were sacrificed to the gods of the nether world, and indicates the probability that this belief is due only to the scholiast's false interpretation of Hom. *λ* 30.

## II.

9. Pp. 81-93. W. Jordan of Frankfort continues his "Homeric novelties" (see *Am. Journ. Philol.* II 266). The motto of the tragedy of the true Iliad is found in Σ 107-110. *Χόλος* is used here in the sense of 'revenge,' which is *γλοκίων μέλιτος*, but is followed by the stifling (*ἥντε καπνός*) feeling of regret. (This interpretation, like many of the rest, must be regarded as novel rather than probable.) In the suspected passage Σ 590-606, the *κυβιστητήρε* must be among the onlookers, and thus we have a distinct separation into two groups. T 147-153 show that Achilles still cherishes his anger against Agamemnon. (They show rather the intensity of Achilles's grief for Patroclus and rage at Hector, which make all treasures seem of little account.) 'Απαρέσσασθαι, T 183, is not a strengthened *ἀρέσσασθαι*, but means 'to refuse to be appeased.' In Υ 18, *ἀγχιστα* is to be connected closely with *δέδηκε* in the sense of 'has almost broken out.' In Υ 70, *χρυσηλάκατος* applied to Artemis is 'spinning gold,' with reference to the golden light of the moon, as he would translate *ἀργυρότοξος*, 'shooting silver rays.' In Φ 1-328, the different parts of the scene are artistic and full of life, but their combination is unsatisfactory. The appeals of the Scamander to the Simois and Apollo are both but fragments; they are unanswered. Jordan supplies the appropriate replies. The scheme which he

suggests for the new arrangement of the book is too elaborate and uncertain to find place here. Τρωτὸς χρός, Φ 568, is to Jordan an indication that the myth of the invulnerability of Achilles was known to the Homeric poets, although in general it is the divine armor which cannot be pierced.

10. Pp. 93-94. Julius Caesar of Marburg, to show that the study of mythology needs not only a lively imagination but also a firm hold on strict philologico-historical methods, calls attention to the carelessness of two mythologists; one of whom (Schwartz) writes of Zeus as having swallowed Semele and her offspring, while the other (Gruppe) understood Hesiod, Theog. 886, ἄλλ' ἄρα μιν (*i. e.* Metis) Ζεὺς πρόσθεν ἔην ἐσκάτ' αὖτο νηδύν, as 'Zeus received her into his thigh.'

11. Pp. 95-102. Adolph Philippi of Giessen remarks on Thuc. VI and VII. The Olympic festival at which Alcibiades appeared with seven chariots must have been Ol. XC, 420 B. C., and not four years later. In VI 46, of the votive offerings on the Eryx, for ἀργυρὰ πολλὰ κτλ. we should read, not ἐπάρ-γυρα, 'plated,' with Meineke, but ὑπάργυρα or ἀργυρὰ τὰ πολλὰ. In view of the sums needed (60 talents monthly, or at least yearly), silver-plated vessels would be of no account at all. In VI 64, καὶ τὰς ναῦς ἐμπήρσειν should stand after αἰρήσειν. In VI 103, for αὐτὸν ἐκομίσαντο, read αὐτοὶ κτλ. In VI 101, πρὸς must be inserted, to read ἀπὸ τοῦ κύκλου ἐτείχιζον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς τὸν κρημνὸν κτλ. Cf. the following: ἐπειδὴ τὸ πρὸς τὸν κρημνὸν αὐτοῖς ἐξείργαστο, and c. 103, ἀπὸ τῶν Ἐπιπολῶν καὶ τοῦ κρημνώδους ἀρξάμενοι κτλ. A number of annoying words or phrases which are unnecessary or at variance with other statements or known facts, are ejected summarily. *E. g.* VI 46 ἐκ τῶν τριήρων, VII 19 ὅπως μὴ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι κτλ., VII 36 οὐκ ὁδὸς αὐτοῖς ἐς πάντα κτλ., VII 53 τὴν ὁλκάδα, VII 56 πλὴν γε δὴ τοῦ ξύμπαντος κτλ., VII 60 ἡλικίας μετέχων (which, in truth, hardly seems to be needed to say of any man in the Athenian camp near Syracuse); in VI 68 οὐκ ἐν πατρίδι has usurped the place of ἐν ἁλλοτρίᾳ.

12. Pp. 102-104. Wichmann of Eberswalde offers a few suggestions of generally unnecessary corrections to the text of Lucian's Dialogues of the gods. I 1, for τί χρὴ λέγειν, he would read τί χρὴ καὶ λέγειν, for XX 11 for πρὸς ὅτι ἀποβλέψω would read πρὸς ὅτι καὶ κτλ. In VIII 1 τί γὰρ χρὴ ποιεῖν he would insert μή before χρὴ. In VI 5 for the vulgate ποιεῖσθαι he would read ἤκειν, and ἐν μέρει for παραμένει in XX 8.

13. Pp. 105-111. Hitzig of Berne reviews W. Roeder's contributions to the explanation and criticism of Isaeus (Jena, 1880). Roeder intends to prepare an exegetical and critical edition of this author. He defends the authority of the MSS against the recent critics who have made unnecessary corrections because they considered inadmissible certain deviations from ordinary prose usage of the uses of the moods. *E. g.* he shows the MS authority for the fut. opt. with ἄν outside of dependent sentences, and makes it probable that Isaeus used even the fut. ind. with ἄν. He claims for Isaeus seven examples of the potential optative without ἄν. He treats also of the omission of ἄν in conditional sentences of the second class (contrary to fact), and the question whether as in Homer so in good Attic prose the subjunctive without ἄν is found in relative sentences relating to the present or future. The answer to this question depends, of course, on each man's view of the value of MS authority.

14. Pp. 111-112. Sitzler of Tauberbischofsheim gives as a supplement to his edition of Theognis the results of the last collation of the best codex, Mutinensis A.

15. Pp. 113-122. Ludwich of Königsberg reviews Abel's edition of Colluthus's Rape of Helen (Berlin, 1880), of which now for the first time we have a revised text with critical apparatus, a firm foundation for our study of the author. Ludwich gives the results of his partial collation of the text of this poem in the just mentioned Mutinensis A. This is the oldest MS of Colluthus, but the editor is thought to have followed it too closely. Thus the rule of Nonnus, to whose school Colluthus belonged, is known to be that a trisyllabic oxytone with short ultima is avoided at the end of a verse. The only exception to this in Colluthus is 177 ἀρωγῶν. This the editor gives, following Mut. A, instead of ἀρωγῶν which conforms to the rule and is found in all the other MSS. The rule just stated is further extended in this poem, in which oxytone amphibrachs are avoided not only at the end of the verse but everywhere, even before the feminine caesura. The editor is praised for his caution in admitting conjectures, but is rebuked for allowing changes which break the Nonnian rules that neither a noun nor a pronoun should ever suffer elision, and that proparoxytone amphibrachs are allowed only immediately before the feminine caesura. The reviewer modifies a former statement that Colluthus seems to have avoided entirely the use of the particle τέ.

16. Pp. 123-128. Hachtmann of Seehausen on Livy XXV. He proposes 16 § 10, *quandoque res quo* for *quando res quoque*; 34, 13 *alia auxilia via haud difficilis* for *alia auxilia haud*, etc.; 35, 8 *utroque* for *tuto*.

17. P. 128. Prebisch of Tilsit would read *ignis* for *ignes* in Ovid, Met. XV 355.

18. Pp. 129-138. Nissen of Strasburg, in defence of his views against Hankel (see Am. Jour. Phil. II 531), gives an interesting discussion of the Roman camp according to Polybius. He rejects Hankel's reduction of the breadth of the *intervallum* from 200 to 100 feet. He sets the breadth of the trench as in general only 6-10 feet. Taking into account the stakes for the fortification which the Roman soldier had to carry, the weight of his pack is calculated to be about 40 kilos (88 pounds), which makes him on the march little but a beast of burden. The length of the side of the camp is reckoned as 2150 feet, leaving 2100 feet (after subtracting the entrance) for which each legion had to provide a wall. Camp was always pitched before a battle. This was one of the first Roman commandments of war. The *velites* had nothing to do with the entrenchment of the camp.

19. P. 138. Prebisch of Tilsit suggests for Quint. Curtius Rufus VII 4, 4 *expertus es unum quemque* to read *expertus es* (in passive sense, 'it is known of you') *tu quoque*.

20. Pp. 139-140. Sommerbrodt of Breslau considers the entire § 58 of Cicero's Cato Major to be an interpolation which interrupts the connection of thought. § 59 takes up the picture of country life which has extended from § 51 to § 57, and in § 60 the whole passage is closed by the thought that these rural joys are open to old age until its last hour.

21. Pp. 140-142. Emil Wörner of Leipzig suggests *astus* for *arcus* in Hor. Car. III 26, 7.

22. Pp. 143-144. Rossberg of Norden offers half a dozen conjectures to the *Silvae* of Statius.

### III.

23. Pp. 145-160. Christ of Munich on a particular kind of interpolations in Homer. Kirchhoff has well said that it is a wholly unscientific procedure to point out passages in the text as interpolations without explaining the aim or reason of such interpolations. Thus the investigations of the origin of the Homeric poems are made more difficult. It is one of the most dangerous mistakes of criticism ancient and modern to remove difficulties by brackets without showing what could have led a rhapsode or a grammarian to insert those verses. The reason for many interpolations can be given at once. An Athenian did not like to miss Theseus among the heroes of the lower world, and so, according to Plutarch, smuggled into the text of the *Odyssey* λ 631 *Θησέα Πειρίθοόν τε θεῶν ἐρικυδέα τέκνα*, and very likely in the *Iliad* A 265 and Γ 144, as it seems to be one of Peisistratus's redactors who in the catalogue of the ships B 558 made the Salaminian Ajax draw up his ships next the Athenians. On a lower level is Θ 533 *ὅς κῆρες φορέουσι κτλ.*, inserted by some versifying grammarian as an explanation of the preceding *κηρεσσιφορήτους*. Much of the same kind are the enumerations of the loves of Zeus, Ξ 317-327, and of the Nereids in the train of Thetis, Σ 39-49. Somewhat more free are the additions of sententious verses and fuller descriptions. Such interpolations are found in the text of every author. Peculiar to Homer are the additions which were designed to bind the separate lays more closely together; e. g. O 390-405, inserted to connect more closely the Patroclea with Λ, or Π 60-79 which were inserted after the *Πρσβεία* had been added, to refer to it. But this article refers to a kind of interpolation which has been less noticed. Whether and how the great national epics of the Greeks, Germans, etc., were developed from single lays is still mooted, but it is undisputed that the bards who on festive occasions sang of the glorious deeds of men and gods did not sing long poems like the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but shorter lays. This is indicated by the contents mentioned, e. g. α 326 fg., θ 73-82, 266-366, 492 fg. The one which Homer incorporates in the *Odyssey* is only 100 lines. Others may have been a little longer. The rhapsodes often had occasion to sing parts of the Homeric poems as we have them. Od. ε-θ form a connected whole, from the mind of one poet, but still on some occasion a bard might sing not these four books but only the episode of Nausicaa, and end with her return to the palace of her father and the prayer of Ulysses to Athene, ζ 316-327. For a fitting close, ζ 328 *ὥς ἔφατ' εὐχόμενος, τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη* was added by the bard, and when this line was fixed in the text, vs. 329-331 were added to separate ζ 328 from η 1 *ὥς ὁ μὲν κτλ.* So the episode of the battle by the river in φ was suited for separate recitation. Sometimes the whole description φ 1-382 was recited, and at other times only vs. 1-227. In the latter case v. 227 was added as a close, and later vs. 228-232 were inserted to separate v. 227 and its equivalent, v. 233. So ζ 311 was added by a rhapsode who ended his recitation there. A similar suggestion is made concerning Σ 356-368 and E 418-430. A more com-

plicated kind of interpolations by rhapsodists is where an episode was particularly adapted for recitation on some occasion, but needed slight additions and changes when it was withdrawn from its original connection, as E 507-511, inserted by a rhapsode who began his recitation with v. 471.

24. Pp. 161-176. Wilisch of Zittau, who had treated the fragments of Eumelus in a programme, gives in detail and with remarks the various passages of the Greek authors which refer to Corinthian epic and lyric poets. He also collects the 14 lines remaining of Corinthian poetry, the pseudo-oracles in Herodotus relating to that city and distichs from Diogenes and Photius, with a consideration of the relation of the government of Corinth to poetry.

25. Pp. 177-184. Friedrich of Mühlhausen in Cicero's Brutus § 145 would read *in augendo*, *in probando* (for *ornando*), *in repellendo*, comparing *de Or.* II 182. In Orator § 9, for *ea quae sub oculis non cadunt, sic*, etc., read *ea quae sub oculis cadunt, ipsa non cadit: sic*, etc.

Pp. 184-185. Harnecker of Friedeberg urges that the *conditi fructus* of Brutus § 16 must be a historical work; not the great history of Rome to which allusion is made Plut. Cic. 41, but a secret history of his times.

26. Pp. 185-188. Dombart of Erlangen, on the Captives of Plautus, defends his previously expressed view that the two prisoners were on the stage not merely during the prologue but during the first act (cf. 105 *istos captivos duos* and 165 *ecum captivum hunc adulescentem*); showing that the examples adduced of *iste* referring to some one not immediately present, as Capt. 986, are not parallel, as in them *iste* is used as a demonstrative of the second person.

27. Pp. 189-192. Plüss of Pforta on the so-called Swan's Song (Car. II 20), of Horace, gives his view of the situation, occasion, design, contents, worth, etc., of the poem. The poet is dead, his friends are sad, his rivals are joyful, the grave is ready, the dirge is sung, the dearest friend speaks the farewell. The soul of the poet answers the last call of his friend with the declaration that he shall live and work in the future as ideal poet in a broader and more appreciative world. The poem may have been occasioned by a sickness or some other experience which made the poet despondent of his power here and made him mindful of approaching death. "Did Horace write all that stuff?" said Lehrs after he had gone through the ode with his criticisms. It is our own fault if we do not appreciate it.

28. P. 192. Teuber of Eberswalde, in Florus II 13, 26, changes *populationibus et pugnae campos aperuit* to *pabulationibus*, etc.

29. Pp. 193-201. Wodrig of Schwedt reviews Luchs's critical edition of Livy XXVI-XXX (Berlin, 1879). The critical apparatus is prepared with great exactness. Here is shown in detail (what had been discovered by Heerwagen and confirmed by Studemund and Mommsen) that besides the Puteanus, another MS of another family, of the third decade of Livy's history, must have been in existence. Of this readings which resemble those of the lost Codex Spirensis are found now in several stragglers. Both families are considered of equal authority. Where they differ, the decision must depend on Livy's usage. In this matter Luchs has exercised good judgment, with critical acumen and proper regard to the views of other scholars. His discussion of



the lacunae in the Cod. Spir. deserves hearty approval. He concludes from the equality of the two missing passages that each occupied one leaf of the original MS. From the false resolution of ligatures it is inferred that H, the most important MS next to S, was copied from a codex of the tenth or eleventh century, and thus may have been copied directly from the archetype of S. A number of critical remarks are made upon the text.

30. P. 201. Oberdick of Westfalen, for *impurissimo* in Cicero *de domo sua* 18, § 48, reads *spurcissimo*, comparing the imitation by Aelidus Lampridius, Alex. Sev. 9, 4.

31. Pp. 202-208. Opitz of Dresden reviews Hildesheimer's *de libro de viris illustribus quaestiones* (Berlin, 1880). He rightly denies Hermann Haupt's claim that the principal part of this book is derived from Cornelius Nepos. The points of agreement are not enough to make him the chief source. The principal authority is wisely assumed to be Hyginus *de viris illustribus*. Livy also was drawn from. Part of the coincidences with Florus are to be attributed to a common use of Livy (perhaps only a full epitome), part to a like use of some unknown author (perhaps the lost books of Livy). But H. believes that this work is not derived immediately from Hyginus's original work, but from a revised and altered copy. An investigation of the sources of Hyginus follows. Opitz shows that he cannot have drawn from Cicero because his report is the fullest. Where the book *de viris* agrees with Cicero it is probable that Varro was the common source of both.

32. P. 208. Bitschowsky of Vienna defends in Lat. Anthol. 21, 255, the reading *pelagus cum litora frangit* by comparing Statius Achill. I 390 and II 104.

33. Pp. 209-224. R. Unger of Halle continues his critical remarks on the text of the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*.

#### IV.

34. Pp. 225-235. Knapp of Tübingen makes a contribution to the explanation of wall-paintings. Among the most charming landscape pictures with *genre* scenes are the two companion pieces in the *casa dei Dioscuri* in Pompeii. In one of these a female figure before a straw-thatched hut, clothed in a violet chiton and buff mantle, with a yellow hat pointed at the top (the hat of many of the Tanagrine terra-cottas, the *θολία*), is recognized as an *ἀγέρτριά μαντευομένη*, a servant of Cybele. By a comparison of similar scenes a connection between Cybele and Priapus is made probable. The scene seems to be a copy of a Greek original. In opposition to a view recently presented, Knapp argues that the agreement between a Pompeian scene (Helbig 1150) and a fragmentary group of the Museo Chiaromonti is nothing but accidental. Incidentally he enumerates a large number of representations of Heracles with the cornucopia.

35. Pp. 236-238. G. Benseler of Chemnitz defends the reading *θηρενταί πάντες*, Plato Rep. II 373 B, and shows from the Laws 824 B that the *θηρενταί πάντες* include *οἱ αὐτόχειρες θηρεύοντες τε καὶ οἱ ἐνυγροθηρενταί, οἱ ὀρνυθενταί, οἱ νυκτερενταί*.

36. Pp. 230-240. Büttner-Wobst of Dresden gives from pre-Euclidian inscriptions a short list of coins, weights and measures which are not mentioned in the Thesaurus of Stephanus: δεκάπουνς, ἐκτεύς, ἡμίδραχμον, ἡμικοτυλ-, ἡμιπόδιον, ἡμιχο-, κρατενταί (as a lead weight), πεντώβολον, τρισχοιν-.

37. P. 240. H. Röhl of Berlin makes two ingenious and plausible emendations to Athenaeus. In III 126 B, a fragment of Nicander, for ἡ αὐτοῦ ὄρνιθος he would read ἡ ἐκ κλυτοῦ ὄρνιθος (the cock), comparing the gloss of Hesychius κλυτὸς ὄρνις ὁ ἀλεκτρύνων. VII 302 A ἔρπε τότ' εἰς ὕδατος στεφάνους = 'go to the market where the finest fish (ὕδατος στέφανοι) are sold.'

38. Pp. 241-267. A. Daub of Freiburg. Contributions to the lives of the poets in Suidas (Hesychius of Miletus). He discusses with especial fullness the articles on Aesop, Ibycus, Nicander, Sophocles, Sosiphanes, Chaeremon, Anaxandrides.

39. Pp. 267-268. Deiter of Emden, on Caesar's Gallic War VII 35, 2. For *misit captis quibusdam cohortibus* he would read *misit ita apertis quibusdam*, etc.; i. e. certain cohorts of the centre marched in open order that the absence of the other two legions might not be noticed by the enemy.

40. Pp. 269-280. Schütz of Potsdam makes critical remarks on the Agricola of Tacitus. 24, 1 *nave prima* means 'with the first fleet,' with which Agricola went beyond the Clyde. This fleet was only of transport boats. In c. 25 we learn that in the sixth year of his command Agricola added a fleet of war ships to his forces (*in partem virium*). Schütz defends 30, 3 *eoque in ipsis penetralibus*, etc., and compares the address of the Roman general c. 34 *fugacissimi ideoque* (like *eoque*) *tam diu superstites*.

41. Pp. 280-282. . . . on an ἀπόρητον Horatianum, the "absolutely unintelligible sentence," Hor. Car. III 10, 9 fg. The writer makes some criticisms in detail, and then asks if any one acquainted with poetry and the Latin language can find in this ode a single attractive, poetical thought, or a graceful figure or a well-turned phrase. He believes it high time to throw such stuff overboard and not confuse or demoralize our scholars with it; to clear out our pseudo-Horace, especially as a reaction seems to be setting in in favor of a more conservative treatment of the poems. (The writer might be advised to read the 27th article of the volume.)

42. Pp. 283-288. M. Herz of Breslau continues his miscellaneous notes on Greek and Latin authors. The fact of the Roman embassy in the 300th year of the city is generally admitted now. Perhaps it is to this that Thucydides refers II 37 (speech of Pericles) *χρώμεθα γὰρ πολιτεία οὐ ζηλοῦσθαι τοῖς τῶν πέλας νόμοις, παράδειγμα δὲ μᾶλλον αὐτοὶ ὄντες τινὶ ἢ μιμούμενοι ἑτέροις*. This certainly does not refer to the Spartans as Classen supposes.

43. P. 288. Thielmann of Speier in the Carmina Priapea (86, 20 Bücheler; 3, 20 Baehrens) would read *neglegens Priapi* for *neglegens Priapus*. The speaker (the statue of the god) warns his boys not to rob his master's garden, but tells them that they may go to the field of the rich man next door who cares little for Priapus.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN.

- Abel (C.) Linguistic essays. 8vo. (English and foreign philos. lib.) \$4.  
Brinton (D. G.) The Books of Chilán Balam, the Prophetic and Historic Records of the Mayas of Yucatan. 8vo, 19 pp. Philadelphia.  
Brinton (D. G.) The names of the Gods in the Kiche Myths, Central America. 37 pp. Philadelphia.  
Halsey (C. S.) An Etymology of Latin and Greek. 12mo. (Classical ser.) Ginn, Heath & Co. \$1.50.  
Hodgson (W. B.) Errors in the use of English. 12mo. \$1.50.  
Morais (H. S.) The Daggatouns: A Tribe of Jewish Origin in the Desert of Sahara: a Review. 12mo, sd., 14 pp. Philadelphia.  
Pindar. Selected Odes, with Notes and an Introduction, by T. D. Seymour. Ginn, Heath & Co. 12mo. \$1.40.  
Skeat (W. W.) An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Macmillan. 8vo. \$2.50.  
Skeat (W. W.) A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Macmillan. 12mo. \$1.25.

### BRITISH.

- Acharya. The Sava, Darsana, Samgaha; or, Review of the Different Systems of Hindu Philosophy. By Madhava Acharya. Transl. by E. B. Cowell and A. E. Gough. 8vo, 270 pp. Trübner. 10s. 6d.  
Alif Laila. Tarjuma I Alif Laila Ba-Zubán—I Urdu (Dafiled Ba-Harfa 't—I—Yu'up). Romanized under the superintendence of T. W. H. Talbot, and ed. by F. Pincott. Post 8vo, 470 pp. 10s. 6d.  
Antoninus. The fourth book of the Meditations of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. A Revised Text, by Hastings Crossley. 8vo, 84 pp. 6s.  
Aristophanes, Acharnians. Translated by C. J. Billson. Post 8vo, 64 pp. Paul, Trench & Co. 3s. 6d.  
Aristotle's Psychology. In Greek and English. With Introduction and Notes by Edwin Wallace. 8vo, 440 pp. Cambridge Warehouse. 18s.  
Bikkers (A. J. W.) Malay, Acheenese, French and English Vocabulary. Post 8vo, 364 pp. W. H. Allen. 7s. 6d.  
Bowman (T.) New Easy and Complete Hebrew Course. Part 2: Irregular Verbs, etc. 8vo, 400 pp. 10s. 6d.  
Cicero's Correspondence, arranged according to its Chronological Order. Vol. I, 8vo. 12s.

Clonston (W. A.) *Arabian Poetry for English Readers*. Privately printed. Impressions limited to 370 copies. Post 8vo, 544 pp. *Wilson & McCormick*. Glasgow.

Euripides' *Hecuba*. With Notes and an Introduction by Rev. J. Bond and A. S. Walpole. (Elementary Classics.) 18mo, 132 pp. 1s. 6d.

Euripides' *Helena*. Edited by C. S. Jerram. 12mo, 170 pp. *Frowde*. 3s.

Genji Monogatari. Classical Japanese Romance. Transl. by Suyematz Kenchio. Post 8vo, 256 pp. *Trübner*. 7s. 6d.

Jarrett (T.) *Nalopakhyanam*. Sanskrit text in Roman characters. New ed., revised. 8vo, 156 pp. 10s.

Inglis (Rev. John.) *Dictionary of the Aneityumese Language*. Cr. 8vo. 6s.

Juvenal. *Thirteen Satires*. Translated into English by H. A. Strong and Alexander Leeper. Post 8vo, 136 pp. *Macmillan*. 3s. 6d.

Ivanoff (A.) *Russian Grammar*. Translated by Walter E. Gowan. 8vo, 140 pp. 6s.

Krapf (L.) *Dictionary of the Suahili Language*. 8vo, 472 pp. 30s.

Livy. Books II and III. Ed. by H. M. Stephenson. 12mo, 310 pp. *Macmillan*. 5s.

Müller (A.) *Outlines of Hebrew Syntax*. Transl. and edited by J. Robertson. 8vo, 148 pp. *Maclehose*. Glasgow. 6s.

Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*. Translated into Telugu, by the Rev. J. E. Padfield. Post 8vo, sd. *S. P. C. K.* 2s. 6d.

*Sacred Books of the East*. Translated by various Oriental scholars, and edited by F. Mx. Müller. Vols. VIII, XII, XIII, XVI. Oxford. 8vo, 446 pp. XLVIII, 456 pp.; XXXVII, 360 pp.; XXI, 448 pp. 52s. Inhalt: VIII. The Bhagavadgītā with the Sanatsugātīya and the Anugītā, transl. by K. T. Telang. XII. The Satapatha-Brāhmaṇa, according to the Text of the Mādhyandīna School, transl. by Jul. Eggeling. Part I, Books I and II. XIII. Vinaya Texts, transl. from the Pali by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hm. Oldenberg. Part I. The Pātimokkha, the Mahāvagga I-IV. XVI. The Sacred Books of China. The Texts of Confucianism, transl. by Jam. Legge. Part II. The Yi King.

Thirkby (Archdeacon.) *Portions of the Book of Common Prayer, Hymns, etc., in the Chipewyn Language*. Adapted for the Slavi Indians by the Right Rev. W. C. Bompas. F. cap 8vo. *S. P. C. K.* 2s.

*Tibetan Tales*. Translated from the Tibetan of the Kah-Gyur, by F. Anton Von Schiefner. Done into English from the German by W. R. S. Ralston. (Trübner's Oriental Series.) 8vo, 428 pp. 14s.

Virgil's *Poems*. Translated into English prose by John Conington. Post 8vo, 420 pp. *Longmans*. 9s.

Williams (Archd. W. L.) *First Lessons in the Maori Language*. 3d. ed. F. cap 8vo. *Williams & Norgate*. 5s.

#### DANISH.

Kalkar (O.) *Ordbog til det ældre danske Sprog (1300-1700)*. 2det Hæfte. *Kjøbenhavn*, 1882. 8vo, 112 pp. à 2 Sp. 7s.

## FRENCH.

Adam (Lucien). Les Classifications, l'objet, la méthode, les conclusions de la linguistique. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 3 fr.

Godefroy, F. Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française. Livr. 13. Paris, 1882. 4to. Tome II. p. 161-240, 241-320. 5 m.

Haumonte (J. D.), Parisot, et L. Adam. Grammaire et vocabulaire de la langue Taensa, avec textes traduits et commentés. Gr. in-8. 15 fr.

Thessalus, F. Traité de l'origine du langage ou formation et déformation des mots. Paris, 1882. 8vo. IX, 240 pp. 10 fr.

Zlatagorskoï (E.). Essai d'un dictionnaire des homonymes de la langue française. 2 édition. *Maisonneuve*. Cart., 6 fr.

## GERMAN.

Adam (Johs.) De codicibus Aeschineis. Diss. gr. 8. (46 S.) Berlin. *Meyer & Müller*. n. 1.20.

Aly (Frdr.) Die Quellen d. Plinius im 8. Buch der Naturgeschichte. gr. 8. (III, 67 S.) Marburg. *Elwert's Verl.* n. 1.80.

Aristidis Quintiliani de musica libri III. Ed. Dr. Alb. Jahnus. Accedunt 2 tab. lith. gr. 8. (LXII, 97 S.) Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 6.

Ausgaben u. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie. Veröffentlicht v. E. Stengel. 1. 2. Lfg. gr. 8. Marburg. *Elwert's Verl.* n. 6. (I-III, n. 19.) Inhalt: La cançun de Saint Alexis u. einige kleinere altfranzösische Gedichte d. 11. u. 12. Jahrh. Nebst vollständ. Wortverzeichnis. Hrsg. v. E. Stengel. 2 Lfg., Wörterbuch. (XIV u. S. 81-260.)

Barth, Paul. De infinitivi apud scaenicos poetas latinos usu. gr. 8. (VII, 66 S.) Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* n. 1.60.

Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Hrsg. v. M. Schanz. 1 u. 2 Hft. gr. 8. Würzburg. *Stuber*. n. 4.20. Inhalt: 1. Die Präpositionen bei Polybios. Von Dr. Frz. Krebs. (147 S.) n. 2.40. 2. Ueber den Dual bei den griechischen Rednern m. Berücksicht. der attischen Inschriften. Von Dr. Steph. Keck. (64 S.) n. 1.80.

Berger, F. Ub. die Heerstrassen d. römischen Reiches. 4. (24 S.) Berlin. *Weidmann*. n. 1.

Bezenberger, Adb. Litauische und lettische Drucke des 16 Jahrhunderts. 3 Heft. Göttingen. 8vo. CXLI, 180 pp. 13 m. Inhalt: Bartholomäus Willent's litauische Uebersetzung des Lutherischen Enchiridions und der Episteln und Evangelien. Mit einer Einl. herausg. von F. Bechtel.

Bolte, Joh. De monumentis ad Odysseam pertinentibus capita selecta. gr. 8. (69 S.) Berlin. *Mayer & Müller*. baar n. 1.20.

Book, the, of Mainyô-i-khard, also an old fragment of the Bundelesh. Ed. by Fred. Charles Andreas. gr. 4. (VIII, 79 S.) Kiel. n. 20.

Brugsch (Heinr.) Hieroglyphisch-demotisches Wörterbuch. 7. (Schluss-) Bd. hoch 4. (VII u. S. 977-1418.) Leipzig. *Hinrichs' Verl.* Subscr.-Pr. n. 112. (cplt. n. 820.)

Chambalu, Aug. De magistratibus Flaviorum. gr. 8. (31 S.) Bonn. *Strauss*. n. 1.



Commentaria in Aristotelem graeca, edita consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae. Vol. IX et XI. gr. 8. Berlin. *G. Reimer*. n. 39. Inhalt: IX. Simplicii in Aristotelis Physicorum libros quatuor priores commentaria, ed. Herm. Diels. (XXXI, 800 S.) n. 27. XI. Simplicii in libros Aristotelis de anima commentaria, ed. Mich. Hayduck. (XIV, 361 S.) n. 12.

Corpus inscriptionum atticarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. III, pars 2. Fol. Berlin. *G. Reimer*. cart. n. 38. (I, II, 1, III, IV, 1, n. 159.) Inhalt: Inscriptiones atticae aetatis romanae, ed. Guil. Dittenberger. Pars 2. (389 S.) (1 u. 2. n. 88.)

Destinon (Just. v.) Die Quellen d. Flavius Josephus. I. Die Quellen der Archäologie Buch XII-XVII = Jüd. Krieg B. I. gr. 8. (129 S.) Kiel. n. 3.

De Vivo, Dm. Grammatica della lingua russa. Con speciale attenzione al movimento dell'accento. Dorpat. 8vo. VI, 344 pp. 8 m.

Engelmann (Rich.) Beiträge zum Euripides. I. Alkmene. 4, 20 S. Berlin. n. 1.

Fischer (Rich.) Quaestionum de praetoribus atticis saeculi quinti et quarti a. Ch. n. specimen. Diss. gr. 8, 48 S. Königsberg, 1881. barr n. 1. 20.

Galenii qui fertur de partibus philosophiae libellus, primum ed. Ed. Wellmann. 4, 36 S. Berlin. *Weidmann*. n. 1.

Geldner (Karl) Studien zum Avesta. 1 Hft, gr. 8, IX, 181 S. Strassburg. *Trübner*. n. 5.

Genthe (Herm.) Grammatik u. Schriftstellerlektüre im altsprachlichen Unterrichte. gr. 4, 19 S. Hamburg. baar n. n. 2.

Gerlach (G. Th.) Der alten Griechen Götterlehre, Mythen u. Heldensagen. gr. 4, XII, 119 S. Leipzig. n. 6.

Heiberg (J. L.) Litterargeschichtliche Studien üb. Euklid. gr. 8, IV, 224 S. Leipzig. *Teubner*. n. 5. 60.

Hierthes (L.) Wörterbuch des schottischen Dialekts in den Werken von Walter Scott und Burns. Augsburg. 12mo, X, 193 pp. 3 m.

Hirzel (Rud.) Untersuchungen zu Cicero's philosophischen Schriften. II. Thl. De finibus. De officiis. 2 Abthlgn. gr. 8, 913 S. Leipzig. n. 18.—1 u. 2. n. 23.

Horaz. 12 Oden u. Epoden, im Versmass der Urschrift übers. v. Lucian Müller. gr. 8, 15 S. St. Petersburg. Berlin. *Calvary & Co.* baar n. 1.

Jülg (Joa.) Vita L. Aeli Seiani Tiberio imperante praefecti praetorio, adumbravit J. J. gr. 8, VII, 38 S. Innsbruck. n.—80.

Kalina (Ant.) La Langue des Tziganes slovaques. Posen. 8vo, III pp. 3 m.

Kalkmann (Aug.) De Hippolytis Euripideis quaestiones novae. gr. 8, 125 S. Bonn. n. 2.

Kāmil, the, of El-Mubarrad, edited by W. Wright. 11 part. The indexes. gr. 4, I, 202 S. Leipzig. n. 16—1—11. n. 80.

Kummer (K. F.) Erlauer Spiele. Sechs altddeutsche Mysterien z. erstenmale, hrsg. u. erläutert. gr. 8, LXI, 199 S. Wien. n. 7. 20.

Laves (Dr. A.) Kritische Beiträge zu Xenophons Hellenika. 4, 22 S. Posen. n. 1.

Lucianus Samosatensis. Franc. Fritschius rec. Vol. III, pars II. gr. 8, CXX, 162 S. Rostock. n. 8. I-III, 2: n. 34.

Madvig (J. N.) Die Verfassung u. Verwaltung d. römischen Staates. 2 Bd. gr. 8, X, 805 S. Leipzig. Teubner. n. 16. cplt. n. 28.

Meister (Rich.) Die griechischen Dialekte, 1 Bd. Asiatisch-äolisch, Böotisch, Thessalisch. gr. 8, VIII, 310 S. Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl. n. 6.

Mewes (W.) Üb. den Wert d. Codex Blandinius vetustissimus f. die Kritik d. Horaz. 4, 24 S. Berlin. n. 1.

Muff (Chrn.) Chor in den Sieben d. Aischylos. gr. 4, 31 S. Halle. n. 1. 20.

Neuerungen der neuen "deutschen Rechtschreibung." Eine Kritik derselben und ein Protest gegen dieselbe. Celle. Literar. Anstalt. 8vo. 128 pp. 2 m. 50 pf.

Nicandri fragmentum, Franc. Eyssenhardt ex codice Ambrosiano exscriptit. gr. 4, 12 S. Hamburg. baar. n. n. 1. 25.

Niese (Benedictus.) Die Entwicklung der homerischen Poesie. gr. 8, VI, 261 S. Berlin. n. 7.

Nietzki (Max.) De Thucydideae elocutionis proprietate quadam, unde ducta, quomodo exculpta, quatenus imitando efficta sit. gr. 8, 68 S. Königsberg, 1881. baar. n. 1. 20.

Otfrids Evangelienbuch. Hrsg. v. Paul Piper. 1. Thl.: Einleit. u. Text. 2. Durch Nachträge erweitt. Ausg. 8. VIII, 295 u. 696 S. Freiburg i. Br. n. 8.

Platonis opera quae feruntur omnia. Ad codices denuo collatos ed. Mart. Schanz. Vol. V. Fasc. 2. Phaedrus. gr. 8, XVI, 178 S. Leipzig. B. Tauchnitz. n. 2.

Platonis Symposion, Phaedrus. Ad codices denuo collatos ed. Martz Schanz. Ed. ster. gr. 8, 106 S. Ebd. —45.

Plüss (Hans Thdr.) Horazstudien. Alte u. neue Aufsätze üb. horaz. Lyrik. gr. 8, XII, 367 S. Leipzig. Teubner. n. 6.

Rabbinovicz (Raph.) Variae lectiones in Mischnam et in Talmud babilonicum. Pars XII. Tract. Baba Kama. gr. 8, VIII, 312 S. München. baar. n. 5. I-XII. n. 71. 50.

Reinisch (Leo.) Die Bilin-Sprache in Nordost-Afrika. Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss." Lex.-8, 138 S. m. 1 Uebersichtstaf. Wien. n. 2. 30.

Rothe (Karl.) De vetere quem ex Odyssea Kirchhoffius eruit Νόστω. 4, 29 S. Berlin. baar. n. 1. 60.

Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialecte. Herausgegeben von W. Braune. III Bd. Halle. 8vo, XII, 166 pp. 2 m. 80 pf. Inhalt: Angelsächsische Grammatik. Von Ed. Sievers.

Schembera (Dr. Alois.) Die Königinhofer Handschrift als e. Fälschung nachgewiesen. gr. 8, VIII, 103 S. Wien. Gerold's Sohn in Comm. n. 3.

Seiler (Frdr.) Ruodlieb, der älteste Roman d. Mittelalters, nebst Epigrammen, m. Einleitg., Anmerkgn. u. Glossar hrsg. gr. 8, XIII, 329 S. Halle. Buchd. d. Waisenhauses. n. 4. 50.

Socin (Alb.) Die neu-aramaischen Dialekte von Urmia bis Mosul. Texte u. Übersetzg. gr. 4, XI, 224 S. Tübingen. n. n. 20.

Sonnenburg (P. E.) De Menaechmis Plautina retractata libellus. gr. 8, 45 S. Bonn. baar. n. 1. 20.

Spiegel (F.) Vergleichende Grammatik der altérânischen Sprachen. Leipzig. 8vo, IV, 559 pp. 14 m.

Studien, französische. Hrsg. v. G. Körting u. E. Koschwitz. 3 Bd., 3-5 Hft., gr. 8. Heilbronn. n. 6. 30. 1-5: n. 12. 50. Inhalt: 3. Die Wortstellung in der altfranzösischen Dichtung "Aucassin et Nicolette." Von Jul. Schlickum. 45 S. n. 1. 60. 4. Historische Entwicklung der syntaktischen Verhältnisse der Bedingungssätze im Altfranzösischen. Von Jos. Klapperich. 65 S. n. 2. 30. 5. Die Assonanzen im Girart v. Rossillon. Bearb. v. Konr. Müller. 68 S. n. 2. 40.

Trumpp (E.) Das Hexaëmeron des Pseudo-Epiphanius. Aethiopischer Text und deutscher Uebersetzung. Aus: "Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften." München. 4to, VI, 88 pp. 5 m. 50 pf.

Veckenstedt (Edm.) Ganymedes. gr. 8, 36 S. Libau. baar n. n. 1.

Wagner (Albr.) Visio Tnugdali. Lateinisch und altdeutsch. Erlangen. 8vo, LXXI, 186 pp. 5 m.

Wellhausen (J.) Vakidi's Kitab al Maghazi, in verkürzter deutsch. Wiedergabe hrsg. gr. 8, 472 S. Berlin. n. 12.

Wüllner (L.) Das Hrabanische Glossar und die ältesten bairischen Sprachdenkmäler. Berlin. 8vo, VIII, 136 pp. 3 m.

Zernial (U.) Das Lied von Byrhtnoth's Fall, 991. Berlin. 4to, 24 pp. 1 m.

Zimmermann (Alb.) De Proserpinae raptu et réditu fabulas varias inter se comparavit. gr. 8, 67 S. Lingen. 1. 50.

Zingerle (Ant.) Kleine philologische Abhandlungen. 3 Hft., gr. 8, X, 83 S. Innsbruck. n. 2. 40. 1-3: n. 6. 40.

#### ITALIAN.

Rezasco (G.) Dizionario del linguaggio italiano storico ed amministrativo. Firenze, 1882. 8vo, XLVII, 1287 pp.

#### BOOKS RECEIVED.

Anecdota Oxoniensia. Nonius Marcellus. Harleian MS. 2179. Collated by J. H. Onions, M. A. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1882.

Harrison (J. A.) French Syntax, on the basis of Edouard Mätzner. Philadelphia. J. E. Potter & Co. 1882. \$2.50.

Körting u. Koschwitz. Französische Studien. III Bd. 1 Hft. Ueber Metrum u. Assonanz der Chanson de geste Amis et Amiles von Joseph Schopp. Heilbronn. Gebr. Henninger. 1882. 1 m. 40 pf.—III. 2tes Hft. Die südwestlichen Dialecte der langue d'oïl. Poitou, Amis, Saintonge und Angoumois, von Ewald Görlich. Heilbronn. Gebr. Henninger. 4 m. 80 pf.

Masson (G.) A compendious Dictionary of the French Language. French-English—English-French. New York. Macmillan. 1882. \$1.

Morais (H. S.) The Daggatouns, a Tribe of Jewish origin in the Desert of Sahara. Philadelphia. E. Stern & Co. 1882.

Skeat (W. W.) An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. Oxford. Clarendon Press. London and New York. Macmillan. 1882. \$2.50.